DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 158 809 JC 780 467

AUTHOR Mark, Sandra Fay
TITLE Faculty Evaluation Systems: A Research Study of Selected Community Colleges in New York State.
INSTITUTION State Univ. of New York. Faculty Council of Community Colleges.
PUB DATE Nov 77
NOTE 152p.; Parts may be marginally legible

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$8.69 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Community Colleges; Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; *Faculty Evaluation; *Guidelines; *Junior Colleges; Literature Reviews; Objectives; Peer Evaluation; Questionnaires; Self Evaluation; State Surveys; Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS New York

ABSTRACT

The objectives of this study were to examine the theoretical foundations and applied practices of faculty evaluation within selected community colleges in New York state. A review of the literature on evaluation systems in higher education provided history, background, and a theoretical framework for faculty evaluation procedures, clarified the problems and goals in evaluation, and considered previous research on evaluation effectiveness. Four community colleges were selected for an in-depth study of applied practices on the basis of geographic region, size of college and uniqueness of evaluation components. The results of extensive interviews and two written questionnaires, which were used to elicit information from presidents, academic deans or vice presidents, division and/or department chairpersons and faculty members, are summarized separately for each campus. Guidelines for faculty evaluation developed on the basis of the findings are presented in the following areas: faculty involvement, purposes of evaluation, flexibility, comprehensive input, peer evaluations, problems with peer evaluators, student evaluations, self-evaluation, evaluating the evaluation process, followup and feedback, individualization, care in hiring practices, perfcrmance and outcome measures, class visitations, and institutional climate. A bibliography, survey forms and supporting documentation are included. (Author/MB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

- ED158809

FACULTY EVALUATION SYSTEMS:

A RESEARCH STUDY OF SELECTED COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN NEW YORK STATE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sandra F. Mark

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

by

SANDRA FAY MARK

Consultant

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Prepared for

THE FACULTY COUNCIL OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

November 1977

JC 780 467

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword	i
Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Introduction	1
Statement of Purpose	1
Statement of Constraints	2
Review of the Literature	3
History and Background in Faculty Evaluation Procedures	3
Theoretical Framework	6
Summary	18
Issues in Evaluation	19
Problems and Ineffective Practices	19
Goals and Strategies in Evaluation	21
Suggestions for Implementation	22
Summary	24
Research on Evaluation Components	25
Self-Evaluation	26
Peer Evaluation	27
Student Evaluations	29
Administrative Evaluation	31
Summary	33
Applied Practices	34
Introduction	34
College A	36
College B	48
College C	60
College D	73
Comparison Data: Questionnaire A	85
Comparison Data: Questionnaire B	88
Recommendations	96
Introduction	96
Overview	98
Guidelines	101
References	109
Appendix A	113
Appendix B	124
Appendix C	131

FOREWORD

The Faculty Council of Community Colleges of the State University of New York is pleased to present this research report on faculty evaluation in selected community colleges.

The Faculty Council is a statewide governance body established as an advisory body by the regulations of the State University Trustees. Consisting of one elected faculty representative from each of SUNY's thirty community colleges, the Council is charged with the following purposes:

(1) To provide opportunity and structure for the faculties of community colleges to formulate positions on policy matters of common interests to the community colleges for transmittal to community college presidents, trustees and sponsors.

(2) To provide an opportunity for the faculties of the community colleges to act in an advisory, consultative, and planning capacity to the Chancellor of the University.

(3) To provide a forum for the consideration of matters of common interest to the faculties of the community colleges.

The President of the Faculty Council sits as an invited observer/resource person at all SUNY Trustees meetings. The Associate Chancellor for Community Colleges is also a member of this Council, and this officer provides liaison and administrative services to the Faculty Council.

In the summer of 1977, the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council supported the idea of sponsoring a research project in the area of Faculty Evaluation. Ms. Sandra Fay Mark, a doctoral candidate at the University of Rochester, was recommended and retained as consultant to conduct the search and prepare the report. This was done during August and September of 1977.

The report has been reviewed by the Chairman of the Faculty Council, and is hereby made available to the community-college community. The findings and recommendations of course are those of the consultant, but the Chairman of the Faculty Council has accepted the report and recommends its examination by all SUNY community colleges in the hope that it can provide avenues and ideas for improvement in this important area.

Mary A. Herlt

Cornelius W. Robbins

ABSTRACT

A research study was conducted of faculty evaluation procedures and practices within selected community colleges in New York state. It involved three elements: theoretical foundations, applied practices, and recommended guidelines for the sponsoring body, the Faculty Council. A review of the literature on evaluation systems in higher education included a look at theoretical frameworks as well as research evidence on evaluation effectiveness. Four community college systems were selected for an in-depth study of applied practices on the basis of the following criteria: geographic region, size of college, and uniqueness of the evaluation components. Campus visitations involved extensive interview procedures along with a written questionnaire of staff involved in various stages of the evaluation system: presidents, academic deans or vice presidents, division and/or department chairpeople and faculty members. A list of recommendations was included to serve as guidelines for the implementation of a faculty evaluation system based on theory and supported by the interview findings.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the staff and personnel of the campuses contacted and visited for contributing their time and energies to this project. Each interview took approximately one and one-half hours or longer, and involved an additional amount of time for completion of a second written questionnaire. Their contributions to this project are invaluable.

I would also like to thank all of the other administrative personnel who participated in the initial surveys prior to the final selection of campuses to be visited. Sincere thanks also to the central office staff of the Office of Community Colleges, State University of New York: without their time, effort and cooperation this project would never have been possible.

And finally, my appreciation to Edward A. Smith for his invaluable assistance in the data analysis, a time-consuming task at best.

Sandra Fay Mark, Consultant

November 1977

INTRODUCTION

Statement of Purpose

The need to consider the various methods of periodic review of faculty at community colleges under the program of the State University of New York was motivated by several factors: economic, programmatic, administrative, educational and political. This research project was conducted in order for the Faculty Council for Community Colleges to address itself to the issues and concerns surrounding faculty evaluation.

A research project into faculty evaluation systems was planned to survey selected community colleges, to gather data on faculty evaluation procedures, to interpret the effectiveness of such procedures, to compare practices with theory from a literature review, and to recommend future directions to the sponsoring body, the Faculty Council for Community Colleges of the State University of New York.

In addition to comparing theoretical considerations with actual practices, this project attempted to make specific recommendations for the improvement of existing faculty evaluation systems. While these recommendations could not be exhaustive in their scope, it was hoped that they would provide a beginning for the Faculty Council and individual campuses in their attempts to change and to improve systems in use. To this end, both effective and ineffective practices were included, with research and/or anecdotal evidence for support.

Statement of Constraints

It should be understood that this survey was not intended to be exhaustive in its scope, content or recommendations. Limitations included amount of time available, as well as the timing of the project during the summer months when many faculty and staff involved in evaluation procedures were not available. A further constraint involved the selection by the administrative staffs of personnel to be interviewed, reflecting a bias of choice as well as one of availability.

While these constraints were quite real and must be considered in the final evaluation of this report, the survey found a unanimous concern amongst those interviewed about faculty evaluation procedures. The recommendations regarding effective and ineffective practices addressed these concerns and thus cannot be ignored. The process of evaluating faculty on community college campuses is a reality and it must be understood by all concerned that any method or process will have consequences - both good and bad. Too often decisions have been made about faculty evaluation procedures without regard for or knowledge of these consequences. It is to this end that this report addresses itself.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

History and Background in Faculty Evaluation Procedures

Probably no other subject creates as much conflict and turmoil within college faculties as evaluation processes and procedures. Evaluation of one's job is inextricably tied to evaluation of one's self, and hence the typical picture one sees in faculties when evaluation issues are raised involves concern, apprehension, anxiety, and fear on the part of the people being evaluated (Cohen, 1974). In fact, Miller has stated that there is an inverse relationship between proximity of evaluation and the willingness to change (Miller, 1974, p. 12). When you are the focus of the evaluation, it is hard to remain objective, both about the process and the outcome.

Community college faculties are justifiably concerned about the purposes and procedures used to evaluate them at a time when enrollments are changing , sometimes declining, when financial resources are sorely taxed and when program retrenchment has become a reality. Of major concern to faculty groups are job security, promotional possibilities and lastly development and improvement. At a time when job security can no longer be assured for anyone, faculty are being asked to involve themselves in self-development and growth programs designed to improve their teaching skills. Is it any wonder that faculties are suspicious of the purposes for which the information gathered on their teaching skills, strengths and weaknesses is to be used? What is called development, growth and self-improvement programs

today, become the means by which decisions for institutional personnel management purposes are made tomorrow. Faculties become wary and suspect of this double message involved in the evaluation system.

Historically, it has not always been so. Before the days of union contracts and negotiated settlements, administrators were relatively free to discharge faculty members for arbitrary and capricious reasons, political and/or personal. According to Cohen "... no instructor has ever been fired from a position in an American community college because students demonstrably failed to learn what (the instructor) tried to teach them."(Cohen, 1974, p.13). Non-tenured faculty were allowed a period of probation beyond which they could not go if they did not attain tenure--up or out. It was rarely necessary for administrators or boards of trustees to give reasons or to show cause for dismissal decisions: it was deemed their right and their responsibility.

During the early days of community college growth, rapid enrollments and new campuses created a huge job market, and it was all college administrators could do to keep colleges fully staffed. The problem then was not evaluation but finding someone to hire. It indeed was a teacher's market. That picture has indeed changed. It is now a college's market, with many more applicants for faculty positions than can possibly hope to be hired. While administrators have become far more discerning in deciding who they will initially hire, they have also become more concerned about maintaining the faculty they have already hired. How will they justify to the Board

retaining the staff in programs that are becoming less viable and less financially feasible? In turn, Board members are concerned with issues of accountability and student outcomes. Often pressured by local legislative bodies' attempts to limit or reduce budget allocations, Board members and administrators both respond with calls for more frequent and more thorough evaluation programs that will provide them with adequate supporting evidence when decisions to retain or to release faculty and staff need to be made.

These issues highlight the central problem with faculty evaluation programs: "One faculty evaluation scheme cannot both judge and assist. The procedure that gathers evidence for dismissal is different from that which reflects a climate of support, of communication, and of growth inducement."(Cohen, 1974). And yet, in most if not all colleges, the same faculty evaluation scheme is used to both judge and assist. The outcome, as might be expected, is more judgment and less assistance. That has been the fear and concern of faculty and it has also become the reality.

While the literature demands separation of the evaluation process into the goals of development and of promotion, salary and retention, it does not indicate how to keep the processes involved in these two goals separate. In this report, evaluation as a process for both goals will be described as it appears in practice and in the literature.

Theoretical Framework

A major criticism of faculty evaluation systems has centered on the lack of substantive theory upon which to base inclusion of various elements. Most systems of faculty evaluation produce "unfair and inconclusive" distinctions among teachers without establishing reliable or valid relationships between what teachers do and what students learn (Meeth, 1976).

Recently, traditional modes of conducting faculty evaluations have been seriously questioned, and new conceptual models have been advanced that represent the body of current theory in evaluation. These models include the work of (1) Miller (1972, 1974), (2) Genova, Madoff, Chin and Thomas (1976), (3) Hind, Dornbusch and Scott (1974), (4) Glasman (1976), (5) Cohen and Associates (1975), (6) Dressel (1976) all on evaluation, and the work of (7) Martin (1975), and (8) Wergin, Mason, and Munson (1976) both on faculty development models.

(1) Miller (1972, 1974)

Miller (1972) theorizes that any system of faculty evaluation must begin with basic assumptions and he recommends the following: (1) the accountability movement will continue, (2) merit evaluation is to be preferred to seniority systems, (3) faculty evaluations are inevitable, (4) improvement is possible in every evaluation system, (5) professional development opportunities must be provided as part of the evaluation process, (6) faculty evaluation should be for both self-improvement and for personnel management.

The concept of "individualized evaluation" is the major principle that moves these assumptions to operational levels. Miller believes that any program of evaluation should be individualized in order to allow for more categories than has traditionally been the case in assessing faculty performance, because a faculty member's professional activity is too varied and complex to be reduced to one or even four sources of input. Secondly, he believes in varying workloads and a weighting system for college faculties that results in a numerical picture of a faculty member's contribution to the institution. A third principle involves effective management and use of evaluative data, without which the entire system cannot operate. This includes an objective, fair, positive, economical and computerized use of any evaluation system. Finally, Miller recommends "strategies for implementation" as the last principle wherein he notes the people who must be involved (presidents, academic deans); the procedures to be followed (trial runs); the problems to be anticipated (faculty resistance); and dealt with through open forums, hearings, etc.; and timing (for implementation, follow-up evaluation of the system, etc.).

Operationally, Miller would have a faculty member develop with the department or division chairperson a performance contract which would lead to the development of tasks and evaluative criteria reflecting the needs of the particular college, the particular department or division, and the interests, skills and needs of the faculty member. A system of data collection and weightings is then suggested which would be used to

calculate an overall performance score for each faculty member.

A major criticism of Miller's system is that it is too exact, too mechanical and too demeaning to suit the art of teaching and the professional level of performance of a faculty member. However, the model does provide for individualization and for flexibility -- elements that are not present in most other evaluation systems. It also allows for greater objectivity in an area where subjectivity and imprecision have been the rule. The model allows for an evaluation system that serves both the purpose of self-improvement and of institutional personnel management decisions, according to Smith (1976).

(2) Genova, Madoff, Chin and Thomas (1976)

"Mutual benefit evaluation" is the name given to Genova, Madoff, Chin and Thomas' model of faculty evaluation, one in which each constituent of the college becomes a real and meaningful beneficiary of the system. A major focus of "mutual benefit evaluation" is the delineation of faculty goals and their relationship to the goals of the college. Otherwise, the model is similar to that of Miller's in the inclusion of many components.

Operationally, the model includes the concepts that an evaluation system for faculty or for administrators should be: (1) multipurposeful and serve a variety of needs, goals, etc.; (2) multifaceted including a comprehensive range of categories and weightings that would allow for individualization of each person's contribution to the college; (3) multisource allowing for the greatest amount of input from a range of sources: students, alumni, faculty, administration, Board members,

community, etc.; (4) multimethod wherein the manner of assessment would be variable for each evaluation system would reflect the needs and goals of the institution within which faculty members operate (Genova et al., 1976, pp.4-5).

An advantage of the "mutual benefit evaluation" model is that it allows for colleges to improve their existing systems by including a checklist for a comprehensive evaluation program, one that the college can use to identify areas of strength and weakness (Smith, 1976).

(3) Hind, Dornbusch and Scott (1974)

A theory of evaluation is proposed by Hind, Dornbusch and Scott that includes an analysis of the control systems operating within an organization. They state that every kind of organization-- from schools, churches, businesses to clubs, etc.-- is really a power structure which has as its goal the control and coordination of activities. They characterized this control as hierarchical with control exercised by organizational superiors, or as collegial, with control in the hands of fellow-professionals of equal rank.

In a study of a university as a professional bureaucracy, in which faculty knew they were participating, the authors looked at the extent to which evaluators and evaluations influence the distribution of organizational rewards and penalties. They describe a professional bureaucracy as one in which the individuals "are oriented toward controls by standards shared by members of their own occupational group." (Hind, Dornbusch and Scott, 1974, p. 118). Such professionals tend to weight more heavily

evaluations made by colleagues, rather than by non-professionals. The authors hypothesized (and found) that the most influential evaluators would be professional colleagues, more influential than superiors in the administrative structure.

Results indicated that faculty perceived students and department chairpeople as having more influence as teacher evaluators than the dean. Results also indicated that faculty perceive administrators as lacking the knowledge or appropriate evaluative criteria as well as the perception that faculty performances are not visible to the administration. The same results were found regardless of faculty rank, indicating a widespread disregard for the input from administration in the area of faculty evaluation.

> "Our theory states that evaluations which are based on greater visibility of performances and outcomes are more likely to be considered soundly based by the participant. In addition, organizational participants, caring about the evaluations of their performance, will want these evaluations to be soundly based so that their performances can affect the evaluation." (Hind, Dornbusch and Scott, 1974, p. 121)

Another finding was that satisfaction with the evaluation process is related to the perceived agreement among evaluators. If evaluators are perceived as agreeing, faculty are less likely to be dissatisfied with their evaluations (p. 124). Additionally, Hind et al. hypothesized that the amount of agreement likely would be based upon a discipline's body of theory, which would provide a common set of standards for evaluation. That is, overall satisfaction with the evaluation process would be positively related to perceived dependence upon theory within a discipline. The findings in fact supported these hypotheses: satisfaction

with the evaluation process is related to perceived agreement among evaluators, which is in turn related to perceived dependence upon a body of theory. This lends support for the professional emphasis on collegial evaluations, which are based upon a shared body of knowledge.

The authors note that teachers who tend to overemphasize the importance of "personality" in producing a good teacher, rather than training, are usually reluctant to permit evaluations by colleagues to be important. On the other hand, nurses, who do emphasize their training as vital to their skill, are oriented to the evaluations of other nurses. They conclude by noting that a shared body of knowledge is thus the major point for collegial control, control which is supposedly control for professionals. (p. 126).

An important finding for issues of institutional change was that while most faculty and staff wanted change, no one acted: all waited. The authors note that the change itself must be carried out by the faculty and it is the faculty which has the power to bring about the change or to thwart it. The evaluation-reward process is seen by the authors as the major device that administrators can use to initiate change when the changes are in a direction that has been endorsed by the professional groups. They would thus include a particular task in the evaluation-reward system if more faculty emphasis on it is desired.

(4) Glasman (1976)

The evaluation of faculty is conceptualized by Glasman to be an administrative function with three domains: (1) faculty need satisfaction, (2) instructors' work environment, and (3) the appropriateness of evalua-

tion instruments. He refers to the sensitive nature of evaluation processes by referring to their judgmental nature which makes them a political issue. Evaluation equals a threat to the faculty's academic freedom and professional independence. Given this nature of the evaluation process as perceived by many faculty members, Glasman nonetheless suggests that administrators need to find answers to the problem of evaluation in a negative environment. Administrators have the responsibility of providing instructors with opportunities for improvement and for establishing a structure of rewards that will increase the concern for teaching. (Glasman, 1976, p. 313).

Glasman refers to the differences between product or outcome evaluations and process or performance evaluations. The former is usually demanded by legislators and the public who want accountablity in the form of student achievement. The latter is usually desired by those (including many faculty) who recognize that many variables affect student learning and outcomes, and that it would be unfair to point to outcomes as a result solely of the teaching process.

The administrative-function of evaluation model solicits student input for evaluation of a teacher's clarity of presentations and reasonableness of assignments; it solicits colleague input for evaluation of a teacher's knowledge. The model also separates self-improvement from administration decisions as purposes of an evaluation system. Evaluation for self-improvement requires feedback which should be diagnostic, detailed, continuous, noncomparative, private and collaborative. Evaluation for administrative decision-making requires data that should

be judgmental, summative, semi-comparative, end of term only, semi-public and corrective.

Additionally, evaluation for student information should be descriptive, summative, comparative, end of term, public (for use by students), and systematic. Evaluation for research on teaching should be nomothetic (seeking logical connections between concepts and their operational definitions), detailed, comparative, variable in time, public, and generalizable. Lastly, evaluation as a reflection of the particular teaching situation under scrutiny should be a significant factor in the design of evaluation instruments.

Glasman believes that faculty can accept or reject the authority to make decisions on evaluation and researchers and consultants can only provide advice and criticism, but without the leadership of academic administrators, the evaluation system's effectiveness will seriously be undermined. He notes further that the model is neither taxonomic nor predictive. Rather, it provides the terminology that can help administrators and others serve the ends of the evaluation goals.

One of the implications of the model for developmental purposes is that it is important for an institution to offer different services to faculty who claim to be satisfied with their teaching and those who claim to be unsatisfied. It is assumed that the kinds of services offered instructors who don't want to learn evaluation skills should be different from the services for those who do. Glasman feels it is in these areas that the administration can and must assume leadership.

(5) Cohen and Associates (1975)

Cohen has written widely on the subject of community colleges and his framework for discussing faculty evaluation systems centers around evaluation as a form of intracampus communication. He believes strongly that evaluation for the purpose of dismissal, promotion, and salary decisions should be separated from that of self-improvement, growth, and development. Faculty evaluation practices reflect group values, should be perceived as being supportive of faculty growth, must enhance student learning, and should reveal institutional values. Finally, Cohen writes that all faculty evaluation turns on self-evaluation; without self-evaluation, all else is meaningless.

Warning that evaluation must not be normative, Cohen believes that the individual accomplishments of faculty should be the sole measure of professional functioning. He stresses emphasizing performance, not personality. However, it is noteworthy that he does not discuss how this could be done operationally.

Finally, he notes that one faculty evaluation scheme cannot both judge and assist at the same time. The process of gathering evidence for dismissal is different from supporting, communicating and generating growth. Administrators and faculty who understand this difference between judgment and assistance can help to develop a two-stage process, the judgmental process taking over only after the assistance process has failed. (Cohen et al., 1975, p. 153).

(6) Dressel (1976)

Another framework for faculty evaluation that incorporates some of the elements discussed in previous models is one by Dressel which characterizes evaluation as both a process and a result: "a means of determining goals, of appraising the processes or paths for reaching them, and of assessing the extent to which they have been met..." (p. 374). For traditional evaluation systems, the implication is that both performance and outcomes are interactive and both need to be assessed in any evaluative context.

(7) Martin (1975)

A model including faculty development as a major emphasis is suggested by Martin, one in which the underlying concept is human development. The process of growth and change during the adult stages must be considered in any program of evaluation for the purpose of self-improvement and development. Martin suggests a multiple approach to this human development program as the only way in which the process can be individualized. He perceives it as a response to the changing needs, interests and skills of faculty, both as individuals and as a body. Also included in the model is the context of the institution and the immediate community within which the faculty member, individually and collectively operates. (Martin, 1975, p. 187).

Operationally, Martin objects to the quantification of outcomes,a process he describes as "trivializing". He expresses an extreme distrust of measurement while underscoring the deep unquestionable importance of

qualitative objectives. Some of those objectives include helping faculty to obtain broader ranges of teaching skills, to encourage in students a mastery of knowledge as well as different ways of knowing, to encourage the process of curiosity and inquiry in students, not just the end product of an answer.

Interestingly, Martin's model of faculty development as human development includes an understanding of the process of resource allocation that boards and legislators face. He proposes that faculties develop a willingness to contribute purposes and criteria that will give to others rationales for the existence and maintenance of specific programs. "Either faculty will participate in determining procedures for assessment or the necessary norms and means will be determined elsewhere." (Martin, 1975, p. 191).

This psychological-developmental model stresses faculty renewal more than it does development: a renewal that is a part of the larger institutional and cultural needs within which the faculty live.

(8) Wergin, Mason and Munson (1976)

The authors see faculty development from the vantage point of an experience-derived model. They participated in a two-year faculty development program and analyzed (in hindsight) the methods that succeeded or failed in facilitating faculty growth and in meeting instititutional needs. This "experience-derived model" is thus perceived as an evolving process that started with low mutual trust and outside consultants seen as experts and changed into greater mutual trust and knowledge and a more cooperative and collaborative consulting role. (Wergin, Mason and Munson, 1976, p. 289).

An important finding was that when the administrator of a division perceived certain needs, on his own, and initiated a series of workshops unilaterally, those workshops did not succeed because the faculty did not support the idea nor did they expect the workshop to solve anything. Additionally, when an ad hoc committee for planning suggested to the consultants that a series of mini-lectures and demonstrations designed to improve cohesiveness would be most effective (and safe), the end result was passive hostility and sabotaging by the faculty.

It was only when the faculty's needs were addressed and when the staff were perceived by faculty to be flexible and willing to change to meet those needs, that the workshops became meaningful and successful. However, even here, the recommendations for change that evolved out of this process were never totally implemented because of diffuse responsibility for effecting the changes. (p. 295).

A fact not unknown in the literature, but supported by their experience, led the authors to conclude that is important to complete a needs assessment before any kind of intervention strategy for faculty growth and development is undertaken. They note time and time again the importance of developing trust and credibility with the faculty before any meaningful dialogue can occur. They note that action plans for intervention must include specification of goals, tasks, responsibilities, and target dates, or they will be ignored. As far as faculty development issues are concerned, Wergin, Mason and Munson found that colleague learning is highest and most powerful when the participants' learning styles are cooperative and when faculty have a great deal of knowledge

about the teaching process. In this situation, faculty tend to learn in an inductive and conceptual manner where direct, non-catalytic effects will be most important. (p. 307).

Summary

The theoretical foundations on which faculty evaluation systems can be supported have only recently been developed. Prior to the 1970's, many if not most evaluation systems were political, personal, subjective and chaotic - largely ignored by faculty as long as it did not interfere with their teaching or job security. With the changing enrollment pictures of the 1970's reflecting the declining college-age populations and with the pressures of negotiated contracts, community colleges especially have begun to re-evaluate their evaluation systems. Attempts have been made to provide objectivity, fairness and evidence for retention and/or dismissal where previously there had been subjectivity, unevenness and intuition and "grapevine" data.

All of the models and theories agree that any evaluation system needs to have a variety of sources of input, that it should be as individualized as possible, that it should reflect the needs and goals of the faculty member as well as the department, institution and community in which faculty operate. The models differ on where the major initiative and emphasis should be: from faculty and peers, from administrators, from the institutional perspective; but all agree that evaluation is a necessary part of the teaching/learning process and must have a positive thrust if it is to have the greatest meaning. Finally, while most of the

models emphasize the need to keep separate the goals of evaluation for growth and development from the goals of evaluation for institutional personnel management, none adequately outlines the operational procedures for doing so.

Issues in Evaluation

Research on teaching and on evaluation reveals needs and problems that must be addressed, as well as issues that remain controversial. Problems that need to be addressed include practices that are ineffective, goals that are not being met, and ways to implement a successful procedure. Issues that remain controversial revolve around the elements of most evaluation systems: the advantages and disadvantages of self-evaluations, of peer evaluations, of student evaluations and scales, and of administrative evaluations. The following section will review the research on these issues as it pertains to community college faculties.

Problems and Ineffective Practices

According to Cohen (1975) most faculties tend to see their most significant work-related problems as difficulty in motivating students, lack of opportunity for professional refreshment, and lack of familiarity with transfer requirements. Additionally, faculties note extrinsic problems such as lack of support or interference from

administrators or colleagues and institutional red tape as prime annoyances. If the factors leading to satisfaction are intrinsic, and with community college faculties satisfaction is related to faculty-student interactions, then satisfaction can be reached by removing any obstacles to these interactions. Such approaches as mandating of smaller classes, allocating aides to assist instructors with routine tasks, providing economic security so instructors are free from concern about lower-order needs are all issues that faculties have been calling for in their professional societies for years. (Cohen, 1975, pp. 115, 140, 141).

Without institutional support for faculty endeavors, all other attempts to influence faculty behaviors will have little effect, according to Cohen. Extrinsic measures of productivity are meaningless because the instructor's motivation is not directly affected. Counting the hours spent on the job and evaluation by observation, may both satisfy external critics, but not teachers. It is only when we understand what faculty themselves feel they are producing that this factor can be linked to work satisfaction for, in Cohen's words, "it is the only one they truly consider." (Cohen, 1975, p. 143).

Most evaluation systems fail because of inadequate planning, poor programs, lack of involvement by key faculty, casual procedures for administering the evaluation instrument, inconsistent procedures for returning the instruments, slow processing time, confusion about who receives the results, application of results solely to promotion and tenure decisions, and excessive costs in money and in time. (Miller, 1974, p. ix, x).

Goals and Strategies in Evaluation

> "Improvement in instruction means using results to assist those who are faltering, to counsel those who are tired, and to encourage those who are uncertain. It may include attending refresher courses, working with acknowledged master teachers, undertaking special study programs, etc. ...(but)... use of data from faculty evaluation should follow carefully planned and understood procedures to minimize the negative overtones that inevitably arise."
> (Miller, 1974, pp. 8-9)

In the best of all possible worlds, Miller's recommendations are obvious to anyone who would use evaluation constructively and wisely. However, in the real world of human frailty, certain guidelines and considerations must be realized. For Miller, process is far more important than product, and he would involve all those associated with the college in the faculty evaluation system. (Miller, 1974, p. 12).

Of greatest importance to any evaluation scheme is the amount of personal investment a faculty member makes in the overall process. It is only when faculty members perceive their own best interests can be realized by the system, when they have contributed to and helped to develop the system, that they will really work for its successful utilization. It is a combination of professionalism, self-interest, pride and gentle persuasion that an effective evaluation system results. Miller notes that "the faculty is at the heart of the collegial enterprise and its members will not be pushed around by colleagues or administrators." (Miller, 1974, p. 13). Considerable leverage can be applied with the use of gentle pressure and sophisticated techniques, but when the opposite occurs, short-run success may occur, but Miller

believes that the long-term viability of programs achieved by such means may be seriously jeopardized. For, after all, it is the faculty who stay and watch, while presidents and deans come and go. (p. 13).

Successful goals for implementing an evaluation system include knowing the faculty, keeping strategies flexible and low-key, having strong administrative support, doing trial runs, anticipating faculty resistance points and dealing with them, allowing time for implementation, and lastly, evaluation of the evaluative process itself. (Miller, 1974, pp. 13-15).

Suggestions for Implementation

At a time when mobility of faculty in higher education has diminished, resulting in low faculty turnover, college administrations may find it more advantageous to try to change the teachers already at an institution, than to try to change teachers. To this end, the prime value of using rating scales and the opinions of others in the evaluation of teaching performance is to allow faculty members to see themselves as others see them (Gilley, 1972, pp. 3, 7). Furthermore, it is by participating in the development of organizational objectives that faculty begin to be committed to those objectives (p. 17). Many of the caveats to administrators and institutions in particular apply equally well to larger organizational units such as state systems. Gilley includes a number of guidelines that central office staffs would be advised to review. These can generally be characterized as management by objectives (Gilley, 1972, pp. 27-28).

One way of attempting to individualize the evaluative process is suggested by Bergquist and Phillips (1975) in the form of "growth contracts," whereby faculty members and their academic supervisors together develop explicit criteria for measuring and rewarding both performance and improvement.

In a 1973 followup to Astin and Lee's 1966 findings on current practices in faculty evaluation, Seldin and Wakin (1975) note that a two-fold trend is evident: (1) more emphasis on professors' on-campus activity, and (2) information gathering on evaluation of teaching performance which is less chaotic, more structured and more concerned with student input (Seldin and Wakin, 1975, pp. 6-7). Committee evaluations increased in prominence from 29% in 1966 to 42% in 1973, reflecting a trend toward decentralization and the sharing of decision-making and responsibility in the evaluation process. The authors state that deans' dissatisfaction with present evaluation schemes accounts for the major impetus in use of new rating formulas. Sixty percent of deans admitted that their personnel decisions were not based on rational, impersonal and unprejudiced information! Seldin and Wakin recommend inclusion of a permanent committee on faculty evaluation at individual campuses which would be composed of administrators, faculty and students. Such a committee would adapt state and national blueprints for faculty evaluation systems to the individual campus environment and would also serve as a monitoring device for practices and procedures on each campus (p.8).

Among the recommendations endorsed by participants at an International Conference on Improving College Teaching, sponsored by the University of Massachusetts Clinic to Improve Teaching, October 1974, were the following:

1. personnel decision-makers should receive adequate training in the interpretation and use of various procedures and instruments for evaluating teaching effectiveness.

2. institutions should commit 1% to 2% of ther personnel budget to establishing and maintaining teaching evaluation services.

3. a faculty development journal should be created to facilitate the exchange of ideas about issues relating to the improvement and evaluation of college teaching.

4. faculty members should be encouraged to participate in research about teaching and learning and should be rewarded for their efforts.

(Faculty Development and Evaluation in Higher Education, 1975, pp. 28-29)

Summary

The major problems that are encountered in research on faculty evaluation systems involves the manner in which the evaluative process is perceived by the faculty and the degree to which they will cooperate with it. When faculty are not motivated to participate in an evaluation program, it is likely that the program will wither and fail -- not because it isn't a sound one, but because the warnings on implementation were probably not heeded. Faculty need to feel responsible for the means by which they are to be evaluated. When evaluation systems are imposed by administrators, faculty are likely to turn a deaf ear to the process. Evaluation is done by people, not procedures, according to

Cohen (1974) and if people are disengaged, even the most comprehensive system will fail. As evaluation systems become more comprehensive, the importance of deans' visitations diminishes, and that of committee review increases. Suggestions include establishing a campus committee composed of all constituents--faculty, administration, students—that would be an ongoing monitoring device for the evaluation of the evaluative system itself.

Research on Evaluation Components

Although a great deal of research on evaluation of teaching effectiveness has occurred, the results have been limited in identifying a clear picture of what constitutes effective teaching skills or more importantly, the means to evaluate them. Research has uncovered advantages and disadvantages of every evaluative component used, but has failed to identify a consistent and generalizable system that can be applied to all colleges, to all divisions, and to each instructor. One conclusion derived from this empirical evidence , as well as from theory discussed earlier, is that an ideal system of faculty evaluation must be flexible and adaptive to the individual's needs, skills and goals. When one component of evaluation is chosen over another, for example student evaluation over peer evaluation, it should be on the basis of gains and losses, of weighing the choices, not on absolute criteria. Each component of evaluation has its strengths, its weaknesses,

its objectivity and its biases. As clear understanding of what these relative merits are can facilitate an informed choice of evaluative criteria.

Self-Evaluations

An honest self-appraisal of one's own teaching style, including areas of strength and of weakness characterize a self-evaluation component. Leonard and Gies (1973) define self-evaluation as a "personal-professional activity engaged in by the individual teacher, sometimes in cooperation with associates, as a means of building individual strengths and eliminating or minimizing weaknesses." (p.54). Self-evaluations are not used to a major extent in higher education at present, although Miller (1974) has stated that most sensitive administrators and professors have learned and benefitted from self-assessment techniques.(Miller, 1974, p. 27). Citing an earlier study by Webb and Nolan (1955), Miller notes that a high correlation between student ratings and instructor's self-ratings was found in a study of supervisor, student- and self-ratings at Jacksonville Naval Air Technical Training School. Interestingly, supervisors' ratings showed no correlation with any other measures obtained: intelligence, level of education, years of teaching experience, or desire to teach. Webb and Nolan found that the more intelligent instructors, and those with more schooling tended to be more self-critical. Those teachers who expressed a greater desire to teach were rated superior teachers by their students. (Miller, 1974, p. 27).

Dressel (1970) states that "self-evaluation is essential to improvement and any kind of evaluation is likely to be both resented and rejected until a teacher confronts (her/his) professional weaknesses." (p. 28). He also sees a relationship between increased attention to resource allocation, which has made institutional self-study both necessary and more prominent, and the introspective thrust into human relations that has given rise to more self-evaluation on the part of the faculty.

Centra (1973) found no agreement between self-evaluation and student-evaluation. Instructors tended to give themselves higher ratings than did their students; however, a correlation of .77 between student and faculty ratings indicates that faculty are at least aware of some of their areas of strength and weakness. (Batista, 1976, p.262).

Guidelines for the use of effective self-evaluation include pre- and post-course student appraisal forms, possible face-to-face confrontations during a class period devoted to course evaluation, subject to the instructor's personality and the students' level of trust, and strong administrative support and encouragement.

Peer Evaluations

Many faculty have argued that only people versed in their particular field and knowledgeable about the problems of teaching-- their colleagues-- can fully understand and therefore evaluate faculty performance. It can also be argued that faculty trust their colleagues to a greater extent than they do supervisors and administrators and students and will therefore be more open and responsive to colleagues' suggestions for

improvement. On the other hand, faculty expect support from their colleagues, as well as loyalty. When peer evaluations have resulted in a negative report, bad feelings and mistrust of the evaluating colleagues can be the rule, rather than the exception. Many faculty therefore shun peer evaluations, both for themselves and as evaluators for colleagues if they want to remain friendly with their peers.

A popular cliche is cited by Farmer (1976) that amongst tenured faculty the belief exists that colleague evaluation can do no good and instead can really cause harm. The rationale behind the cliche is that there is never enough money in the budget to provide adequate rewards for meritorious service described in a positive evaluation and the harm that can accrue from a negative evaluation includes damage to one's reputation which would affect promotional decisions, merit raises and renewal of continuing contracts. (Farmer, 1976, p. 434).

Sometimes outstanding teaching generates negative feelings amongst colleagues such that their peer evaluation would be far from objective. Guthrie prefers many students' opinions which he regards as more trustworthy judgments to those obtained by a faculty jury of seven. Because different characteristics may be ascribed to good teachers by students than by faculty, Hildebrand, Wilson and Dienst concluded that colleague evaluation should be used to supplement and not substitute for student ratings. (Batista, 1976, p. 262).

Whatever criteria are used for evaluation of colleagues, Batista underscores the importance of standardizing procedures and the creation of equally valid alternative ways of evaluating peers. He lists faculty behaviors in which colleagues are typically in better positions to evaluate than any other person or group. The list includes: up-to-

date knowledge of subject matter, knowledge of what must be taught, knowledge and application of the most appropriate or most adequate methodology for teaching specific content areas, knowledge and application of adequate evaluative techniques for the objectives of the course, professional behavior according to current ethical standards, etc. (Batista, 1976, p. 269). When colleague evaluation is used in those areas where colleagues are in the best position to know, along with student and administrative input, the end result according to Batista, is a more systematic and objective evaluation process of faculty as well as a more complete one. (p. 270).

Student Evaluations

One of the most controversial elements of the evaluative process involves the use of student evaluations. Its proponents emphasize that it is the single most significant measure of teaching performance, while its detractors emphasize that it is nothing more than a popularity contest. There is research evidence to show great reliability amongst student evaluations over time, and with alumni evaluations. There is also evidence to show that students can be biased in the kinds of evaluations they give to faculty with different amounts of experience.

According to Miller (1974) "the evidence clearly indicates that students can evaluate teaching fairly and perceptively. Although some may disagree, the substantial majority of those who have written on the matter conclude that students can evaluate fairly and perceptively ...

the evidence on the reliability is clear and consistent. Good reliability can be expected." (Miller, 1974, p. 30).

Dwyer (1973) reviewed sixty-two studies on characteristics and relationships of selected criteria for evaluating teaching effectiveness. He found the following to be true of student evaluation studies: (1) reliability of student ratings is a function of the number of raters; the greater the number of student ratings, the greater the reliability; (2) no significant relationships exist in ratings regarding teaching experience, age of teacher, class size, sex of teacher or student, severity of grading and maturity of rater; (3) students tend to give lower ratings to instructors who emphasize the obvious, are not prepared, are authoritarian in manner, or who use sarcasm; (4) student ratings do not reflect an instructor's knowledge of subject matter or knowledge of acceptable teaching procedures (5) students rated higher those instructors with higher degrees, when ratings of course organization were compared with degrees held by the instructor; (6) students and alumni show considerable agreement in their ratings of the same teacher; (7) students and supervisors do not consider the same characteristics of teachers as important in relation to teaching effectiveness. (Dwyer, 1973, pp. 51-52).

In direct conflict with Dwyer's second finding is the work of Adams (1973) who found that students tend to give younger instructors higher ratings. Also, Centra (1972) found that female teachers were more likely to know when their students did not understand the material, were more concerned with student progress, made more comments on papers and exams, and generally made better use of class time than male teachers.

However, courses taught by male teachers were rated more difficult and more stimulating than courses taught by female teachers. Additionally, students' ratings showed no relationship to course grade attained, achievement or gradepoint average. Inconsistent findings relate to student evaluations and class level as well as size of class. According to Gage (1961) some evidence does exist for higher ratings for elective courses than for required courses. Although too few studies exist on the relationship between student evaluations and the time of day, Miller cites one study that found classes held during the middle of the day received higher ratings than classes held in the early morning. (Miller, 1974).

Advocates of student evaluations emphasize the use of standardized forms and procedures that minimize problems with reliability. A number of such instruments are available from publishers, for a fee. Uniform procedures for administration of student evaluations are required, since it has been found that students will give lower ratings to instructors who leave the room and who use forms on which students' signatures are not required. When procedural safeguards are provided, student evaluations can contribute a unique source of input to a comprehensive faculty evaluation program.

Administrative Evaluation

The traditional approach to faculty evaluation systems has usually been supervisory or administrative review of teaching performance. Classroom visits were the preferred mode of obtaining information about teaching performance prior to the re-evaluation of practices that began in the 1960's. At present, administrative evaluation is still a critical

element in most faculty evaluation programs, although its importance is being diminished with the inclusion of other evaluative elements such as peer evaluations, student and self-evaluations.

Gies and Leonard (1973) note that college professors generally oppose subjective evaluations by administrators even though most are rated and evaluated regardless of such feelings. They refer to a community of power by which American colleges operate, rather than to a hierarchy of power, which should make administrators wary of imposing a comprehensive system of evaluation on their faculties. "Only a misguided college administrator would fail to realize that a vigorous and proud faculty will not submit to mandated policies and practices. In a very real sense, the faculty retains control of the institution in professional matters." (Gies and Leonard, 1973, p. 54).

The role that administrators play in a faculty evaluation system is one of leadership, according to the authors. They believe that the impetus for change has its origins in the administration, but must be agreed to and acted upon by the faculty and generally implemented cooperatively. (Gies and Leonard, 1973, p.55).

Miller cites one case example of a small college of about 1,000 students where a visiting team was comprised of the academic dean, the department head and a colleague of the teacher to be observed, supposedly a sympathetic friend. He describes this procedure as "overkill" in view of the professional time committed to one such visitation and he predicts that it would fail and fall of its own weight. (Miller, 1974, p. 20).

Summary

Research evidence on the various evaluative components reveals a mixed picture of effectiveness. Self-evaluations can be helpful in pointing up areas for improvement, and these tend to correlate somewhat with student evaluations of areas of weakness. Peer evaluations are described both as the best system of faculty evaluation and the worst, depending on one's point of view. Peer evaluations can be extremely powerful tools to weigh factors that only faculty can have direct knowledge of, but important safeguards must be instituted to protect both the teacher and the colleague from negative fallout due to critical and negative evaluations.

Student evaluations are even more mixed than peer evaluations in the research literature. While most writers encourage the use of student evaluations, many faculty believe that students are too biased by personality factors and immaturity to make their evaluations valid. Research has shown that student evaluations are extremely reliable over time and are an important element in giving faculty feedback with regard to how they are coming across to their audience. Administrative evaluations, while being the most dominant factor historically, have diminished in importance as other elements have been added to a comprehensive evaluation system. Writers in the field suggest that the significant role that administrators can play in the evaluation process is one of leadership and direction. While other elements may be included in a comprehensive faculty evaluation program, these are the major areas of focus in the research literature.

APPLIED PRACTICES

Introduction

In order to ascertain what current practices were being used for faculty evaluation purposes, a survey was conducted of community college personnel. This informal telephone survey sought to find those campuses that had an updated system, one that was in writing, and one that was perceived by the chief administrative officers to be an effective system. Of the thirty colleges contacted, fourteen responded positively to the above criteria, and these were asked to submit their documents for further study.

Final selection of the four campuses to be studied in depth was made on the basis of the following criteria: representative geographic location, size variation, use of a unique component in the evaluation system. Each campus selected was then contacted, and interview schedules arranged with the key personnel involved in the evaluation system. The following personnel were interviewed on each campus: president, academic dean or academic vice-president, division chairpeople, department chairpeople, faculty representatives to evaluation committees, faculty evaluators, faculty who had been evaluated.

Each individual was interviewed with Questionnaire A (Appendix A) for approximately one and one-half hours. Questionnaire B (Appendix B) was then left with instructions to complete on their own and return to me in person or by mail. Questionnaire A was based in part on research conducted by James E. Boyd and E. F. Schietinger (1976) and the St. Louis Junior College District (1974) and included open-ended questions written

for this survey by this author. Questionnaire B was based on formats outlined by Richard Miller (1974).

In order to provide privacy and confidentiality, the descriptions of the colleges visited have been disguised; all of the information, however, has been reproduced as given. Each campus is described separately, with a summary of responses included in each section. A comparative summary of all the colleges has been included at the end of this section.

College A

Nestled in the hills of a resort area in central New York state, College A is a medium-sized institution with approximately 2400 full-time equivalent students. It offers a variety of programs including liberal arts and sciences, business, electrical and mechanical engineering and technology programs. Personnel interviewed included the president, academic dean, division chairpeople, elected faculty evaluators, faculty representatives to the evaluation committee, and faculty from other divisions who were not otherwise involved in the evaluation process. Personnel interviewed at College A had a total average of 8.25 years of experience: females averaged 9 years full-time and 2 years part-time; males averaged 8 years full-time and no part-time.

The present faculty evaluation system was negotiated as part of the collective bargaining process in 1972-1973 by a combination of people drawn from the academic council (division chairpeople, office of instruction), the evaluation committee (faculty and administrative representatives), and from the administrative council (deans and the president). The original goal was to streamline the evaluative process and to include a component for a growth contract.

Table A-1 summarizes College A's responses to the ranking of reasons for doing faculty evaluations at the institution. For the most part, there is agreement that the prime reasons for doing faculty evaluations are for the purposes of institutional personnel management - salary, promotion, retention and tenure - and least of all to provide data for research on teaching.

Table A-1

Weighted Average	Reason for Doing Evaluations in Ranked Order at College A	Frequency of Response 1	2	3	4	5	N/A
1.13	1. to provide information needed in making decisions on salary, promotion and tenure.	5	1	2	0	0	0
2.00	2. to provide a basis for general faculty development.	4	0	4	0	0	0
2.00	2. to provide each faculty member with diagnostic information concerning instructional behavior and effectiveness.	0	8	0	0	0	0
4.00	3. to assure equity of employment practices with regard to sex & ethnic differences.	0	0	2	4	1	1
4.38	4. to provide data for research on teaching and learning.	0	0	2	1	3	2

The evaluation process at College A involves the following steps and procedures:

1. For non-tenured faculty, an evaluation every year for the first four years to decide whether the person should continue at College A.

2. After the fourth year, evaluation is at the option of the faculty member if promotion is desired, or if there is a question raised by the president, division chairperson or dean regarding the teacher's performance.

3. Classroom visits are conducted by the division chair and by an elected division evaluator who is a faculty member of the division. These visits are summarized in a written report and discussed with the teacher who then signs them indicating only that they have been read, not necessarily agreed with.

4. The teacher develops a self-evaluation indicating areas of strength, growth from previous year, as well as areas in need of change. It also includes accomplishments and activities and service to the college and community.

5. Student evaluations are strongly encouraged. The format used is one developed by the former dean and therefore is not standardized.

6. Other supporting information, such as letters of support, are added to the evaluation file which is then forwarded to the evaluation committee for its consideration and recommendation.

7. The evaluation committee reviews the teacher's file and considers the long-term contribution of the faculty member to the institution. For non-tenured faculty, when the file indicates negative feedback, the committee generally allows tolerance for the first year, expects effort to be shown by by the second year, and decides to retain or dismiss by the third year. The division chairperson for the faculty member under consideration becomes a voting member of the evaluation committee, for that faculty member only.

8. The evaluation committee makes its recommendations to the President, also chairperson of the committee itself, who then makes his recommendations to the Board of Trustees.

9. It has usually been the case that the President's recommendations to the Board are the same as those of the evaluation committee. This indicates that a good deal of work goes on in the evaluation committee's deliberations that would ordinarily be done by administrative staff alone.

10. An appeal is possible to the evaluation committee by a faculty member in the event of a negative decision.

College A's evaluation system has the following mandatory features: classroom visits by division chairpersons, classroom visits by faculty from the same division, a self-evaluation instrument, discussions between peer evaluators and teacher. While student evaluations are not mandatory, they are strongly encouraged.

The personnel interviewed at College A failed to agree on who was principally responsible for faculty evaluations for the purpose of salary increase, promotion and tenure. Of those surveyed, 63% perceived

the evaluation committee as having the prime responsibility for decisions about institutional personnel management, and 25% felt the responsibility belonged to division chairpeople, while 12% felt it was the President's responsibility. On the other hand, there was complete agreement that division chairpeople were primarily responsible for evaluation for the purpose of development and self-improvement.

When asked what the consequences were, both good and bad, of this particular evaluation system, the responses of personnel interviewed showed both positive and negative effects. Among those responses listing positive consequences are the following:

"1. improved performance of some poor or marginally-able teachers.

"2. it is a very positive thing in my own case and my own division, although I know it can be traumatic.

"3. it helps the faculty member become more confident, is uplifting for morale, for those not evaluated well, it gives them food for thought. I used my evaluation to change my style.

"4. evaluation now is less traumatic; there is less talk about it.

"5. there is a general feeling of trust and support.

"6. there has been a positive improvement of instruction; it keeps faculty on their toes.

"7. it allows the elected peer evaluator a chance to ask questions that might be perceived as hard and bad by the faculty being evaluated."

Among those responses listing negative consequences of the same evaluation system are the following:

"1. it has serious negative effects on the morale of faculty who've had negative evaluations. It has also had a negative effect on faculty in fostering a sense of competition that is not needed, not beneficial to the faculty, but which might result in political benefits for some faculty.

"2. possible negative effect is that peer evaluations are a potential problem in that we tend to approve of teaching styles similar to our own, and when we see situations that are different, we tend to perceive them as bad.

"3. some colleagues stopped speaking because the evaluator hadn't recommended them for promotion. A great deal of pressure. Negative evaluations are difficult for faculty to take sometimes.

"4. it hasn't made a hell of a lot of difference, except to separate faculty into three groups: those to dismiss, those to keep happy and those to recognize and reward.

"5. only the month of November is used for evaluations. This helps to cut down on the number of people evaluated. But some faculty no longer have clear expectations of what the college wants from them.

"6. a weakness is in its failure of ways to reward outstanding faculty.

"7. merit and faculty awards have become so competitive and therefore negative that faculty may do things that are expected of them, rather than what they may really want to do.

"8. there is a great deal of time involved in the process. It identifies problem areas without suggesting a solution."

When personnel at College A were asked of the relative strengths of the present faculty evaluation system, their responses were varied and covered a range of issues. Following are some of the comments:

"1. it does an extremely thorough and patient consideration of the decisions to be made with the materials and information it has to work with.

"2. it is constantly changing, is being revised all the time. It affirms that good teachers are good and bad teachers are bad.

"3. the student evaluations provide me with more data. Peer evaluators are a good idea; they are more important than supervisors.

"4. it provides a general feeling of trust and support.

"5. it makes the whole evaluation process less intimidating for new faculty. It allows faculty time to concentrate on important issues - their own classroom development.

"6. it provides a basis of support for untenured faculty, especially if there is a personality conflict between them and the division chairperson. The conflict is negated by the presence and input of the division evaluator.

"7. it is going to force new instructors to look more at themselves and how they teach. A little pressure is good in shaping each of us up. It helps to safeguard the institution from making mistakes (in hiring and retention). It helps to produce better teachers as a group, in the future, than tenured ones.

"8. it allows faculty to sit in the shoes of administrators and to wrestle with the problems of decision making - a complex job."

These same individuals perceived weaknesses in the present system and highlighted a variety of issues that were in need of remedy. Following are some of their comments:

"1. it pretends that the data it presents is reliable. It really involves the quality of the relationship between the person being evaluated and the evaluator.

"2. a classroom is a strange place. The relationship built up between teacher and students is upset by visitors.

"3. student evaluations are the weakest link. We do not handle it so that they take it seriously. We overuse it: students take it four times in one semester.

"4. it cuts down on the number of people to be evaluated and allows for this process only during the month of November.

"5. it fails in ways of rewarding outstanding faculty.

"6. it encourages competition.

"7. it doesn't really help people make changes from a 'have-not' to a 'have' category of teaching skills.

"8. it creates too much anxiety for people being considered. The deliberations of the evaluation committee are somewhat too secretive. It is a political process."

The impact on an individual's time, energy and workload because of the present faculty evaluation system depended upon whether the person interviewed was a division evaluator, a member of the evaluation committee, a division chairperson, or a faculty member being evaluated occasionally. Those directly involved in the evaluation process for others experienced a greatly increased workload and expenditure of time and energy in visitations, meetings, discussions with faculty, etc. As a faculty member being evaluated, there is a small burden of paperwork, concentrated prior to the month of November. Administrators generally agreed that the process was more streamlined now, more formal, and less stressful.

Resources were generally felt to adequate at College A. Personnel interviewed felt there was adequate travel money allowed, adequate released time allowed, and a minor lack of follow-through to the evaluation process. More people felt there was a lack of resources in general than anything else. This included facilities, equipment, etc.

College A encountered no major problems in the implementation of its evaluation system. However, some resistance was described by the faculty as well as a lack of interest by students.

Personality issues were felt to be important in the faculty evaluation process at College A, but in general, the system was perceived to be effective in minimizing the amount of conflict. The most significant reason for this effectiveness was the variety of inputs into the evaluation process. The potential for abuse decreases when more than one person is involved in the evaluation process, according to several

of those interviewed. Other responses were:

"1. yes it's an issue and plays a large role. A faculty member is evaluated here largely on image, which is a function of personality...

"2. if there is a clash, and there is, it's more of a clash between pedagogical stance, traditional versus humanistic; than a personality thing.

"3. as an evaluator, I'm aware of personality differences, but I try not to let these affect my evaluation."

Those interviewed were unanimous in their perceptions that the faculty evaluation system at College A not only allowed for feedback opportunities, but required these as part of the total process. Included were followup to visitations through discussions, the requirement that faculty sign the evaluation to indicate it had been read but not necessarily agreed with, feedback from the evaluation committee, from student evaluations. The form of feedback is both informal in discussions, and formal in writing.

Although for various reasons, all of those interviewed felt that the present faculty evaluation system was of value to them personally. Most of those evaluated as teachers felt that it had contributed greatly to changing and understanding their teaching style, while those who had been evaluators gained an increasing respect for individual faculty differences and for the variety of values and methods observed. Selected comments follow:

"1. it has given me an opportunity to see many different styles and techniques. I feel in a privileged position. I've gained a lot. I ask myself 'who am I similar to?' I look at my own style and reflect on it. I find I do a lot of testing of values. Having been evaluated helps me to be well-prepared and to become aware of my own style of teaching.

"2. student and peer evaluations are very important to me. They help me to interpret peers and students.

"3. I consider student evaluations an important source of feedback regarding my performance. Division chairpeople and evaluator's evaluations are somewhat important.

"4. It is good to see people rewarded and recognized.

"5. evaluation is an essential part of work. I needed the kind of feedback I got to modify my effectiveness."

Ideal System

A second focus of the interview questionnaire was to look for an "ideal" system, one that the respondents would choose if they could, according to their own personal philosophy. Questions about an ideal system included if and how evaluation and development issues should be kept separate, what wasn't involved in their present system that they felt ought to be, how they would change the present system if they could, the relationship between a system's flexibility and the degree of satisfaction with it. The following summaries deal with these "ideal" issues.

Responses were mixed to the question of whether evaluation for development should be separated from evaluation for salary increase, promotion and tenure. Sixty-two percent felt that no faculty evaluation system could keep the two issues separate, nor should it try, whereas thirty-eight percent felt that while it might be difficult, if not impossible, it ought to be tried. Following are selected responses:

"1. Hell no!

"2. I don't think you can separate them. You need the carrot and the stick, therefore both purposes of evaluation should be done by the same process.

"3. Don't think it can be, nor should it be. But there should be a way of using the process to help faculty improve.

"4. Inherently they're separate and should be kept separate due to the cycle - spring semester is time to experiment and fall semester is when you're evaluated.

"5. Yes the two issues should be kept separate, but I don't know how. The faculty here feel it's a problem. They find it difficult to listen to suggestions and recommendations about their teaching at a time when they're concerned with tenure, promotion and salary. We spend much time and energy on (the latter) and tend to stop before we get into improvement area."

When asked what an ideal system of evaluation should include, the personnel at College A listed the following items as carrying the most weight, as summarized in Table A-2:

Table A-2

Weighted Average	Criteria for Evaluation System Most Heavily Weighted Items	Frequency of Response 5	3	1	0
4.75	classroom effectiveness, however measured	7	1	0	0
4.25	availability to students outside required office hours	5	3	0	0
4.00	contributions to division	4	4	0	0
3.75	development of instructional materials	4	3	1	0

Those items carrying the least weight, and therefore having the least importance in the "ideal" composite system were the following, as summarized in Table A-3:

Table A-3

Weighted Average	Criteria for Evaluation System Least Weighted Items	Frequency of Response 5	3	1	0
1.25	responsibility for environmental tasks	0	2	4	2
0.88	personality and self-promotion	0	1	4	3
0.63	work toward a doctorate	0	0	5	3
0.50	personal life style	0	0	4	4

The preferred mode of measuring faculty accomplishment at College A was by performance criteria for fifty percent of the respondents. Outcome criteria were preferred by 25%, and a combination of performance and outcome criteria was preferred by 25%. There was general agreement to include most of the methods listed for measuring performance criteria, 75% - 84%, but far less agreement on what to include in measuring outcome criteria. This reflects in part, the greater familiarity of most personnel with performance criteria and a lack of experience with outcome criteria.

About half of those responding to the question of what isn't involved in the faculty evaluation system that should be felt that the college should provide more opportunities for the improvement of instruction and opportunities for faculty to grow and to change. The remainder of responses included a clearer definition and sense of college goals and priorities, need for an evaluation expert on campus to be engaged in institutional research, greater student interest in the evaluation process, and reward structures at the disposal of deans or division chairpeople wherein money could be added to an instructor's salary, but not taken away.

The ways in which respondents would change the system if they could varied and represented different points of view and emphasis. The following are included as a sample:

"1. There is a real danger that those things that are more visible are those things faculty will do to be more visible in order to get rewards, instead of working with their teaching, which is less visible.

"2. I'd divorce evaluation for improvement from evaluation for promotion and tenure.

"3. I'd do improvement better.

"4. I'd add help to the system by opening up the classroom to each other to observe differences in styles and to reduce student and teacher threat of visitations.

"5. I'd return to some kind of merit.

"6. I'd get the reference of the growth plan out of the contract."

There was unanimous agreement with the statement that the more flexibility a campus has, the more satisfaction there is with the evaluation process. All of those answering responded affirmatively; they also felt that College A was a flexible campus, some felt to a fault, and therefore that there was general satisfaction with the present evaluation system.

College B

Located in the heart of a large urban setting in far western New York state, College B draws approximately 4455 full-time equivalent students to a large, multi-building campus that offers a variety of applied programs in architecture, business, computer science, dental hygiene, graphic arts and advertising, performing arts, electrical and mechanical technology, drafting and liberal arts program. College B has experienced a high rate of administrative turnover in recent years which has been coupled with an increase of tension between the faculty and Board of Trustees over recommendations from the faculty evaluation system. Both of these events have created an atmosphere of wariness and concern on the part of the faculty with regard to decisions by the Board regarding promotion, and retention matters. The absence of a strong administration has helped to intensify the conflict between faculty and Board.

Personnel interviewed at College B included the acting president, the vice-president for academic affairs, two department chairpersons, and two faculty members, one of whom served on an ad hoc faculty evaluation committee involved in developing a faculty evaluation program. The ad hoc commitee was chaired by one of the department chairpersons interviewed. The total experience of the staff at College B averaged approximately 9 years: females averaged 12 years full-time and males averaged 4 years full-time.

The present faculty evaluation system was developed by an ad hoc committee of faculty. The Board of Trustees charged the ad hoc committee

with the task of developing a new evaluation system for the purposes of determining salary increases, promotion and tenure decisions, and not for the purposes of faculty growth and development. The ad hoc committee was also mandated by the Faculty Association contract which stated that a new faculty evaluation system needed to be developed. Members of this ad hoc committee included administrative and Board representatives, as well as faculty. The system developed by this ad hoc committee is a peer-evaluation system, centered within each department/division of the college, with minimal input from administrators and, at this time, from students.

Table B-1 summarizes College B's responses to the ranking of reasons for doing faculty evaluations at the institution. It is interesting to note that even though the present faculty evaluation system was not designed for the purpose of faculty growth and development, this reason came in a close second to the first ranked one, evaluation for the purpose of salary, promotion and tenure. After the development and improvement reason, personnel at College B ranked diagnostic information as the third most important reason for doing faculty evaluations. The reason ranked last was "to provide data for research on teaching", similar to College A's rankings.

Table B-1

Weighted Average	Reasons for Doing Evaluations in Ranked Order at College B	Frequency of Response 1	2	3	4	5	N/A
1.83	1. to provide information needed in making decisions on salary, promotion and tenure.	3	1	2	0	0	0
2.00	2. to provide a basis for general faculty development.	3	0	3	0	0	0

Table B-1 Continued

2.17	3. to provide each faculty member with diagnostic information concerning instructional behavior and effectiveness.	2	2	1	1	0	0
2.67	4. to assure equity of employment practices with regard to sex & ethnic differences.	1	2	1	2	0	0
3.17	5. to provide data for research on teaching and learning.	1	1	1	2	1	0

At College B the evaluation process involves the following components and procedures:

1. Central to the evaluation process are peer evaluators who are different for each faculty member to be evaluated, and who come from the department's tenured ranks.

2. The faculty member completes a self-assessment and goal objectives instrument which then circulates amongst the tenured evaluators who describe the degree to which the faculty member has achieved success toward meeting those objectives. This is done through class observations and daily interactions between the faculty member and the evaluators.

3. Three peer evaluators each hold a pre-assessment meeting with the faculty member before each visits a different class. After the visitations a post-assessment meeting is conducted in which the peer evaluators and the faculty member discuss the areas of accomplishment and the areas in need of improvement. The peer evaluators write up a summary of their visits and meetings, to which the faculty member has access and, in fact, must read.

4. A meeting of all the tenured faculty in the department results in a vote for or against reappointment, promotion or tenure. If the group has questions or raises issues not covered in the meeting, it can decide to review the file further and gather additional information before a vote is taken. In the event of a divided vote, the committee investigates thoroughly. It sees the department chairperson, the faculty member, the peer evaluators, etc. If the vote is unanimous, a unanimous statement is written. If not unanimous, a majority and minority report is written and must be signed.

5. The entire evaluation file is then forwarded to the appropriate faculty committee (Retention and Tenure or Promotion) which includes the vice-president for academic affairs (ex officio) for its recommendation which is then forwarded directly to the Board of

Trustees for its action. The faculty committees on Retention and Tenure and Promotion bypass the President and send their recommendations directly to the Board.

College B's evaluation system has the following mandatory procedures: classroom visits by peers within the same department, self-evaluation, discussions between peer evaluators and the faculty member, and achievement of stated course objectives. While student evaluations are included as part of the procedure, they have not as yet been made operational at College B, due partly to money and time constraints.

There appears to be a lack of agreement to the question of who is primarily responsible for faculty evaluation for the purpose of salary increase, promotion and tenure. Of those surveyed, 66% perceived the faculty committees on Promotion and on Retention and Tenure as having the prime responsibility for institutional personnel management decisions, while 34% believed this responsibility belonged to the Board of Trustees. On the other hand, 50% felt that no one was responsible for evaluation for the purpose of faculty growth and development, 34% felt the department chairpeople were responsible and 16% felt the Dean was responsible (vice-president for academic affairs).

When asked what the consequences were, both good and bad, of this particular evaluation system, the responses of personnel interviewed showed both positive and negative effects. Among those responses listing positive consequences are the following:

"1. able, through peer evaluations, to eliminate the obviously unprepared academician.

"2. there is now one grievance procedure through the union that is a good one - previously there had been two.

"3. it has built up a greater trust in the retention and tenure process; it is now more equitable.

"4. it is a vast improvement over the prior system, but it is not used as I think the committee intended it to be.

"5. it has resulted in an awareness of what we're doing - the things that make for good, effective teaching.

"6. some faculty will take the evaluation seriously and will make changes."

Among those responses listing negative consequences of the same evaluation system are the following:

"1. there has been departmental dissension between factions supporting or failing to support a faculty member and therefore lowered departmental morale and effectiveness.

"2. it eliminates self-improvement which is not built into the system - it is only superficial.

"3. there is no institutional process for development and growth. It has exacerbated relations between the faculty and the Board of Trustees. There is no follow-up to the recommendations.

"4. the board members have been able to personally interfere with the functioning of the evaluation system."

When personnel at College B were asked of the relative strengths of the present faculty evaluation system, their responses were also varied and covered a range of topics. Following are some comments:

"1. it requires every faculty member to be evaluated periodically through self-assessment. There is a yearly evaluation for non-tenured faculty and those up for promotion. Faculty get the chance to see what others are doing and to talk about effective teaching and to share ideas.

"2. it keeps evaluation out of the hands of administrators and the Board. It maintains peer evaluation and maximizes peer input to faculty reappointment, promotion and tenure.

"3. it forces the faculty and the department to look closely at what they're doing and look at the member as a total professional, not just in the classroom.

"4. it gives a good evaluation of teaching performance and self-appraisal evaluation.

"5. it's good at evaluating the function of community colleges - teaching plus overall commitment to the college."

The same individuals perceived weaknesses in the present system and highlighted those issues that were in need of attention. Following are some comments:

"1. the evaluation process is seen as a threat, not as a learning experience for the faculty because the Board has fired faculty members in the past because there was something negative in their evaluation report. Now faculty are reluctant to put in writing anything remotely considered negative.

"2. students are not involved in the process.

"3. diviseness and splits in a department are difficult to avoid in cases where the decision isn't clear cut. Departmental unity is strained. I'm afraid the system allows a certain amount of mediocrity in order to avoid confrontation, strain and conflict.

"4. personality issues - universal in all systems. Ignorance on the part of the Board of the intent of the system. They have a decision-making mentality, not a case-building one.

"5. the way we structure it there is little opportunity for assessment for teaching improvement.

"6. it cannot be developmental in the present context because of the present Board.

"7. lack of administrative input. The faculty committees are not accountable as is the administration."

The impact on an individual's time, energy and workload because of the new system was perceived by all personnel at College B as being much greater - in fact, as horrendous! Because more people are directly involved in the evaluation process of any one faculty member, there is an increased load in terms of time spent in committee meetings, writing and reviewing recommendations for the file, and time spent in meetings with the individual faculty members.

Resources were felt to be partially adequate at College B. Most, if not all, personnel interviewed felt there was adequate travel money and time allowed for faculty development purposes. However, opinion was divided in half with regard to follow-through of evaluation recommendations and resources in general and the adequacies of same.

College B encountered some major problems in the implementation of its evaluation system. The major problem was administrative resistance, understandable since the present system manages to all but bypass administrative input. Some staff indicated a lack of money and lack of interest by students were problems, two issues which are related since the student evaluation instrument "Cafeteria" has not yet been implemented due to financial and time constraints.

While personality issues were felt to be potentially important, most of those interviewed felt that the system in use did an adequate job of diffusing negative fallout and of preventing abuses. The most significant reason for the system's effectiveness with

regard to personality issues was the number of people involved in the process, and the system of hearings when split-decisions occur. This doesn't eliminate the impact totally. Additional reasons for the system's effectiveness was the right of faculty to choose their peer evaluators in concert with the division chairperson.

Those interviewed at College B agreed with College A's assessment that the faculty evaluation system not only allowed for feedback oppotunities, it required these as part of the total process. Those components that are mandatory - visitations, pre- and post-visitation meetings, signed documents in file, access to all documents at all times by faculty member - insure that feedback opportunities are provided.

Most of those involved in the evaluation process felt that it had been of value to them personally, although for different reasons. Following are selected comments:

"1. after agonizing over one, probably the one we have is, on balance, the best of all possibilities in practice.

"2. it helped me to get to know the faculty more extensively, especially the non-tenured ones.

"3. I got a promotion out of it! I feel better about it!

"4. it increases awareness, currency, and communication with colleagues.

"5. it gives me feedback on what my peers think of my performance."

Ideal System

A second focus of the interview questionnaire was to ascertain an "ideal"system, one that the respondents would choose if they could, according to their own personal philosophy. Questions about an ideal system included if and how evaluation and development issues should be kept separated; what wasn't involved in the present system that they felt ought to be and how would they change the present system if they could; the relationship between a system's flexibility and the degree of satisfaction with it. The following summaries deal with these ideal issues.

Half of those interviewed felt that the issues of evaluation for self-improvement and for personnel management decisions needed to be kept separate; the other half felt they couldn't and shouldn't be separated. Following are selected comments:

"1. issues should be kept separate because the developmental system is voluntary, whereas the decision-making system is mandatory.

"2. yes, they are separate issues, but only after the process has taken place. If not, then the teacher teaches what you're looking for.

"3. yes, salary issues should be kept separate, but it's okay to mix the others in a non-punitive system. Tenure and promotion should not be an up or out process.

"4. no they go hand in hand.

"5. in utopia yes, keep separate, but here I don't think it's possible.

"6. student evaluation forms should be available to faculty as well as to the administration."

When asked what an ideal system of evaluation should include, College B's responses listed the following items as carrying the most weight, as summarized in Table B-2:

Table B-2

Weighted Average	Criteria for Evaluation System Most Heavily Weighted Items	Frequency of Response 5	3	1	0
5.00	classroom effectiveness, however measured	6	0	0	0
4.67	availability to students outside required office hours	5	1	0	0
4.33	innovation in teaching methods	4	2	0	0
4.00	course or curriculum development	3	3	0	0
4.00	development of instructional materials	3	3	0	0

Those items carrying the least weight, and therefore having the least importance in the "ideal" composite system, were the following, as summarized in Table B-3:

Table B-3

Weighted Average	Criteria for Evaluation System Least Weighted Items	Frequency of Response 5	3	1	0
1.50	personality and self-promotion	1	1	1	3
1.50	community service	0	2	3	1
1.00	responsibility for environmental tasks	0	1	3	2
0.67	personal life style	0	1	1	4
0.50	political activity outside the campus	0	1	0	5

The preferred mode of measuring faculty accomplishment at College B was by performance criteria for 82% of respondents. Outcome criteria were preferred by 28%. There was general agreement to include most of the methods listed for measuring performance criteria, 64% - 100%, but far less agreement on what to include in measuring outcomes. This reflects in part the greater familiarity of most personnel with performance criteria and the lack of experience with outcome criteria. It is also consistent with the responses of College A.

A developmental system was cited most often as the element that should be involved in the faculty evaluation system, but wasn't. There was no institutionalized way of using data generated by the evaluation procedure to insure professional growth. Another component mentioned was lack of student input. One objection to the present system was that it was a one-shot procedure. Instead, some kind of long-term, structured input was suggested. This input would be over a period of four years and would be a good way to get a true picture of faculty performance, rather than merely looking at an annual performance review. Another lack was the absence of administrative input into the evaluation system.

Two major themes emerged as suggestions for change desired in the present system. One involved the elimination of the direct involvement of the Board of Trustees in the evaluation procedure. One suggestion was to channel evaluation recommendations through the

President with one guarantee:

> "...If the President didn't agree with the recommendations of the faculty committee, the President would have to give reasons only to the committee. If at that time, the committee did not go along with the President, both recommendations would be sent to the Trustees."

Another suggestion would have bound the Board of Trustees to carry out the will of the evaluators in making recommendations for tenure, etc. The second theme centered on the heavy amount of time and energy, as well as paperwork involved, in the present system which many felt needed to be changed and reduced. Also cited for change was the amount of dissension generated by the system. One suggestion to deal with this divisional conflict involved having professionally trained counselors involved in the evaluation process to facilitate departmental meetings, as is already happening in some divisions of College B.

All of those interviewed agreed that the more flexibility a campus has, the more satisfaction there is with the evaluative process. However, most of these individuals felt that this did not accurately describe College B. As one person put it:

> "The process is fine, except for the last step in which it falls down and crumbles into a big heap!"

Others felt that it was a strong system that allowed for individualization, but that also was not totally satisfying to the entire faculty.

College C

One of the oldest and largest community colleges in New York state, College C is located in a suburb of a large metropolitan area in central New York. During its history, College C had a long and stable administration which supported the present system of faculty evaluation on a divisional basis by a process selected by each division and approved by the President. Approximately 4,000 full-time equivalent students attend College C in pursuit of a wide selection of curricula and one-year programs including the traditional liberal arts, business, criminal justice and nursing programs, as well as more innovative programs in accounting, architecture, construction supervision, manufacturing practices, practical electronics and television servicing, and surveying. Personnel interviewed at College C included the president, academic dean, one department chairperson, one division chairperson, two faculty members not otherwise involved in the evaluation process. The personnel interviewed averaged approximately 10 years of full time experience at the College.

The present faculty evaluation system was developed by the entire college after the president decided each division would come up with an individual system - either by department or by division. Each unit would be given a choice as to the procedures they wanted to use for evaluation purposes. Each year anew, every unit arrives at a consensus on any changes desired in the methods and procedures of evaluation for that unit and submits its recommendations to the president for approval. Most evaluation procedures involve some system of class

visits with followup and written summary, as well as evaluation of grading procedures and course outlines. When the evaluation system was originally devised in 1972 it was a part of the faculty contract; however, it has since been withdrawn from the contract.

Table C-1 summarizes College C's responses to the ranking of reasons for doing faculty evaluations at the institution. The two major reasons for conducting a faculty evaluation program at College C according to personnel interviewed, were for the purposes of institutional personnel management and for faculty development and growth. Of least importance in the present system is the provision of data for research on teaching and learning.

Table C-1

Weighted Average	Reasons for Doing Evaluations in Ranked Order at College C	Frequency of Response 1	2	3	4	5	N/A
1.50	1. to provide information needed in making decisions on salary, promotion and tenure.	5	0	0	1	0	0
1.83	2. to provide a basis for general faculty development and improvement.	1	5	0	0	0	0
2.33	3. to provide each faculty member with diagnostic information concerning instructional behavior and effectiveness.	1	2	3	0	0	0
3.83	4. to assure equity of employment practices with regard to sex & ethnic differences.	1	0	1	1	3	0
4.17	5. to provide data for research on teaching and learning.	0	0	2	1	3	0

At College C the evaluation process involves the following components and procedures:

1. Central to the evaluation process is the division or departmental vote each year which establishes the procedures and the criteria by which faculty within those units wish to be evaluated. By October 15th of each year, each unit submits to the President for approval its recommendations for evaluation procedures which may be the same or revised from previous years. While the evaluation procedures vary according to department or division, they tend to revolve around classroom visitations by the chairperson and/or peers within the unit, with a review of the faculty member's objectives, outlines, etc.

2. A student evaluation instrument is optional.

3. Administrative input is partly through a parallel system of informal evaluation by the dean's office which is primarily for non-tenured faculty and designed to help faculty to achieve growth and improvement in instructional skills.

4. Several departmental/divisional procedures are outlined to show the similarities and differences according to discipline:

   (A) Humanities

   This process attempts to allow faculty to express their own philosophy of education, to be evaluated by a team that uses criteria and methods mutually agreed on. The division chairperson, department chairperson, faculty member and selected faculty within the same division form an evaluation team which meets to establish evaluative criteria in two areas: (1) effective classroom teaching, (2) other contributions to the college. The evaluation team reaches agreement on methods. Mandatory procedures are: classroom visits. Optional methods are student evaluations, sets of corrected papers, course outlines, sample lessons. Classroom visits are preceded by a conference, then the visitation, then the post-visitation discussion and written evaluation with opportunity for rebuttal.

   (B) Math/Science

   There is a Promotion-Retention-Tenure committee within the division made up of the division chairperson, the department chairperson, a maximum of two peers elected yearly by the division and serving for all faculty to be evaluated within that division for that year. This committee meets with individual faculty and mutually agree on methods which are suggested but not mandatory. There are usually class visitations, a review of tests given, attainment of objectives. Each visitation is followed by a written summary which faculty sign and keep a copy of, as well as verbal discussion of the visitations. The written report is sent to the division chairperson and ends up in faculty's file in the dean's office. When the administration's Promotion-Retention-Tenure committee meets, the report is read in the presence of the division and/or department chairpersons.

(C) Social Sciences

An assistant chairperson, appointed to serve as a divisional evaluator, asks for course outlines, etc., has a meeting with individual faculty to decide on the specific criteria they wish used from the general division criteria approved by vote. Two periods of evaluation: fall for retention and tenure, spring for promotion. The discussion leads to a written document by the faculty member which includes a statement of goals and objectives (self-assessment) which becomes part of the faculty's file and is used by the department/division chairperson in their evaluation process. Agreement is then made as to when visitations are to be made--a casual process. After visitations and other data are collected, the assistant division chairperson submits to the faculty member a position regarding retention, promotion and tenure. The assistant then gets feedback from the faculty member who may challenge the assistant chair's position by discussion or by asking a peer to submit an evaluation separately. It is the option of the faculty to have peers brought in, but this has happened only once. Any disagreements with the assistant chair's position are submitted in writing by the faculty member to the assistant chair. This file is then submitted directly to the administration's promotion-retention-tenure committee which reviews the file and makes a recommendation to the President, who in turn makes a recommendation to the Board of Trustees. While the assistant chair is conducting an evaluation of faculty, the regular division chairperson is also conducting one, the idea originally meant to serve as a team effort. However, in practice, this is not the case.

5. The divisional recommendation is forwarded to the retention-promotion-tenure committee which reviews the file and makes its recommendations to the President. While not binding on the President, these recommendations have usually been passed along to the Board for their approval.

Although faculty evaluation is accomplished separately by division, College C's program involves the following mandatory features: classroom visits by administrators (division chairpersons and assistant chairs), visitations by faculty from the same department/division, discussions between peer evaluators and the faculty member, discussions amongst administrators, peer evaluators and the teacher. All other elements that appear within each division's guidelines are optional, chosen at the discretion of the department/division.

There appears to be a lack of agreement to the question of who is principally responsible for faculty evaluations for the purpose of salary, promotion and tenure. Of those surveyed, 50% perceived the department and division chairpersons to have the prime responsibility, whereas 50% felt this responsibility belonged to the administration through the president, the retention-promotion-tenure committee and the dean. For the purposes of faculty development and improvement, 67% felt the department and division chairpersons were primarily responsible, and 33% felt the academic dean to be responsible.

When asked what the consequences were, both good and bad, of this particular evaluation system, the responses listing positive consequences were as follows:

"1. no grievances other than one in five years.

"2. faculty involved in setting procedures as to how they will be evaluated. They are very supportive of the system.

"3. the general feeling is that the procedure is fair. Everyone gets her/his just desserts.

"4. there are valuable benefits for those going through it due to the feedback.

"5. faculty have a better feeling about evaluation because of the formal procedures.

"6. it's forced the division to look at evalution more carefully. The evaluation process must be reviewed every year. We've kept old system until last year. We suspended meetings on changes in the system. We opened up the evaluation process. It allows faculty to be a part of their own evaluation process."

Among those responses listing negative consequences of the same evaluation system are the following:

"1. older faculty doesn't take evaluation seriously enough. It has not been done for growth and development, but for the contract which has been limiting and which has destroyed collegiality. I'd like to see it more informal.

"2. faculty mistrusts administration outside of own area.

"3. we don't grapple with the nuances of teaching. We deal with procedure rather than criteria. I'd like to see the reverse: what to evaluate first, rather than procedures to use.

"4. it hasn't made a significant contribution to improving instruction.

"5. there is turmoil within the division because of lack of promotions. Faculty have resisted being peer evaluators which is a function of the environmental situation (no promotions).

"6. peer evaluations are not a good idea, even though they are an option. Morale problems created within the department, animosity develops, not as much as when done by the department chairperson.

"7. on the retention-promotion-tenure committee, there is a constant danger of the faculty representatives being taken erroneously as the faculty advocates.

"8. morale of some people isn't good because they feel department chairperson is against them, mostly those who've been turned down for promotion.

"9. general faculty morale now is low due to problems with the contract. This may affect the evaluation system.

"10. only bridges should be judged by their piers."

When personnel at College C were asked of the relative strengths of the present faculty evaluation system, their responses were varied and also covered a range of topics. Following are some of the comments:

"1. emphasis is on your contribution to the student, what you do in the classroom.

"2. promotes those it should, gives tenure to those it should.

"3. establishes a close line of communication between evaluators and the faculty member.

"4. forces the evaluatee to look more closely at herself (himself).

"5. built-in safeguards for faculty - no surprises.

"6. forces us to look at our teaching, materials and methods - no one likes it, but when forced into it there are some positive benefits.

"7. flexible, timely, comprehensive - allows for a variety of criteria.

"8. only one grievance in five years.

"9. individualized and with total concurrence of the faculty. "

The same individuals perceived weaknesses in the present system and highlighted a variety of issues that were in need of remedy. Following are some of their comments:

"1. optional student evaluations.

"2. don't do evaluations for improvement of instruction.

"3. division chairpersons may become upset with the time schedule: within a ten week period, after the 5th and before the 15th for all faculty to be evaluated within the division for the year.

"4. too time-consuming for a large department or division. May therefore discourage newcomers because of the amount of data required.

"5. there is the premise that faculty evaluation for tenure is threatening.

"6. the need to develop an environment that is not threatening.

"7. we're looking for bad things, not a positive thing.

"8. because of many disciplines there is the feeling among many that 'what does a faculty member in a field different from mine know of my subject?'.

"9. no training for doing evaluations.

"10. the system leans toward a charade. Real key is a master's degree plus 15 hours and five years experience to satisfy the objective criteria. We follow norms rather than excellence.

"11. that only two personalities (assistant chair and division chair) have alot to say about your career."

A much heavier workload was experienced by half of those interviewed who attributed this to the present evaluation system. Some felt that the increased time and paperwork was healthy and a good idea. Others felt that the time expended was irrelevant to them personally. For those directly involved in the process, increased time devoted to committee meetings was most often cited as the major impact.

Resources were generally felt to be adequate at College C. All personnel interviewed felt that there was adequate travel money available. A majority felt that there adequate released time possible for self-improvement purposes, and a majority also felt that there was no lack of resources in general. The only area where resources were felt to be inadequate, and by half of those interviewed, was in the area of follow-through. Here there was a lack of effort devoted to following up the diagnostic prescriptions indicated in the evaluation process, according to half of the staff questioned.

College C encountered only one major problem in the implementation of its evaluation system. A lack of student interest was cited by the majority of those interviewed as the major difficulty point. Otherwise, the implementation of the new procedure appeared to go smoothly without incident or problems.

As was the case with College B, those interviewed felt that personality issues were potentially dangerous in any evaluation system but that the present system at College C did an adequate job of diffusing negative fallout and preventing abuse because of the team or committee structure. Others felt that the variety of options available to faculty through the different divisional methods deals effectively with personality issues. Conflict is dissipated by choice of method and by the

number of people involved in the process. The system deals with differences and controversy by having faculty bring in a peer evaluator and submitting a challenge in writting, to be included as part of the faculty's file. One individual felt that there was a tendency not to promote, however, in such cases of controversy. Another felt that the three faculty representatives on the retention-promotion-tenure committee tended to keep the evaluator honest, and served a watchdog role, rather than taking the initiative in the evaluation process. Some faculty feel that personality issues would be greatly diminished if the division and department chairpersons could be elected rather than appointed by the President.

Consistent with College A and B was the assessment that College C's system allowed for and required feedback opportunities at every step of the evaluation process. "Everything is in writing and has to state whether faculty is being recommended - for the dean, only in writing if the faculty member is up for tenure." In general, the feedback system was felt to be open, positive and adequate. One area of concern was feedback after the promotion-retention-tenure decisions are made: little discussion other than a yes/no response is available to faculty at that time according to one person interviewed.

Most of those involved in the evaluation process felt that it had been of value to them personally, although for different reasons, as the following selected comments demonstrate:

"1. we need one, definitely, to serve the function within the the system of making people accountable for their jobs.

"2. there should be formal evaluation of department chairs and division chairs. They need to be evaluated as evaluators. Accountability for everyone.

"3. feedback, growth. It allows the administration and institution to examine its priorities with the end result of comprehensiveness.

"4. it has been of value for informational purposes.

"5. I trust the divisional reports. When I do an observation, I have the idea of confirming all the things I've heard of about the instructor.

"6. gets me to know what's going on in the classrooms - and the faculty are aware that I know it.

"7. suggestions have been helpful and useful to me for my own teaching improvement, especially on methods and teaching aids. I look forward to it.

"8. as a faculty member, the process has had little value."

Ideal System

A second focus of the interview questionnaire was to ascertain as "ideal" system, one that the respondents would choose if they could, according to their own personal philosophy. Questions about an ideal system included: if and how evaluation and development issues could and should be kept separate, what wasn't involved in the present system that ought to be, how they would change the present system if they could, and the relationship between a system's flexibility and the degree of satisfaction with it. The following summaries deal with these ideal issues.

Only one-third of those interviewed felt that the issues of evaluation for growth and self-improvement and evaluation for personnel management decisions needed to be kept separate. The majority felt that while this might be desirable, it was not possible. Following are representative comments:

"1. the two issues should be separated because people feel vulnerable when evaluated and therefore more defensive and less objective.

"2. that's where our process has fallen down; we're not getting the kind of improvements in classrooms that we should.

"3. the issues should be kept separate because of the differences it makes in how you feel about being evaluated: to be helped or to be dropped.

"4. don't think you can separate the issues, because a lot of people need feedback. I feel everyone in the division should go through the system.

"5. don't see how to keep separate. You can use a "growth" system to make decisions without having decision as a basic intent of the system.

"6. No, can't keep separate. On this campus, they're mixed.

"7. No, they ought to be the same."

When asked what an ideal system of evaluation should include, the personnel at College C listed the following items as carrying the most weight, as summarized in Table C-2:

Table C-2

Weighted Average	Criteria for Evaluation System Most Heavily Weighted Items	Frequency of Response 5	3	1	0
5.00	classroom effectiveness, however measured.	6	0	0	0
4.67	course or curriculum development	5	1	0	0
4.33	contributions to dept./division	4	2	0	0
4.33	attendance and reliability	4	2	0	0

Those items carrying the least weight, and therefore having the least importance in the "ideal" system were the following, as summarized in Table C-3:

Table C-3

Weighted Average	Criteria for Evaluation System Least Weighted Items	Frequency of Response 5	3	1	0
1.67	work toward a doctorate	0	2	4	0
1.67	taking enrichment courses outside your own field	0	2	4	0
1.33	community service	0	1	5	0
0.83	political activity outside campus	0	1	2	3
0.33	personal life style	0	0	2	4

The preferred mode of measuring faculty accomplishment at College C was by outcome criteria for 67% of the respondents. Performance criteria were preferred by only 33%. Interestingly, even though performance standards were not preferred by the majority, there was almost unanimous agreement that all measures listed in question five should be included. On the other hand, although most people preferred outcome methods, there was agreement on only half of those methods listed, indicating that the measurement of outcomes is a more difficult and less obvious task than measuring performance. Thus, College C differed from Colleges A and B in its preference for outcome measures.

Three areas of concern were mentioned in the question about what needed to be involved in the present system that wasn't. First, several of those interviewed felt that the division and department chairpersons needed to be more responsible in making evaluative decisions. Sometimes the division chairs wait too long to meet an evaluation deadline. Sometimes the visitations take place two days before the retention-promotion-

tenure committee of the administration meets. Evaluation ought to be a continuous process, not concentrated during a few weeks in the Fall semester. Secondly, others felt that the issue of development and growth needed to be included in the evaluation system. Finally, several staff felt that students should have a greater role in the evaluation process.

Several suggestions for changes in the present system echo responses to the previous question: increased student input, more movement in the direction of outcome-oriented mechanisms which are not now used, something to show movement in student learning. Additional comments indicated a desire for greater peer involvement in the evaluation process, as well as the need for a change of faculty attitude toward growth and development purposes:

> "Go back to the collegial system and have it become more flexible. Take it out of the contract, but keep it as it is. It should be faculty-controlled, but administered and coordinated by the administration."
>
> "Do away with peer evaluations and substitute stronger division and department chairperson evaluation."

While a majority of those questioned agreed that the more flexibility a campus has, the more satisfaction there is with the evaluation program, personnel unanimously agreed that College C would be characterized as a very flexible campus. Characteristic of those agreeing with the statement was the following: "the more diverse an administration is in measuring the professoriate, the greater individualization there is, and hence the more satisfaction." Those opposed felt that flexibility was not necessarily the key to satisfaction. Rather, the more input into the process on the part of those being evaluated, the more receptive the faculty.

College D

One of the smallest colleges in the community college system, College D draws approximately 900 full-time equivalent students to its older, multi-building campus in the south central part of New York state. Seven curricular offerings include liberal arts, business, criminal justice, individual studies, radiologic technology. In addition to these, three one-year programs are offered in clerical studies, practical nursing and secretarial studies. College D had recently experienced a change of administrative officers involving the president, academic dean and associate dean. College D appeared to be more noticeably traditional than the other campuses visited in that the administration was far more visibly in control of the evaluation system than elsewhere. The faculty evaluation system is a new one, not fully operational at the time of visitation; however, it does concentrate heavily on student input in the form of the "Idea" system of student evaluations. Although this new system had been in use only one semester, it appeared that College D not only valued student input, but unlike the other campuses, made this value operational.

Personnel interviewed at College D included the president, academic dean, assistant to the president and former dean, a division chairperson and two faculty members not otherwise involved in the evaluation process. These personnel averaged approximately 4.8 years of full time experience at the college: females averaged 1 year and males averaged 5.5 years.

The present faculty evaluation system was developed with the faculty and administration having input through the division chairpersons, the associate dean and the dean of instruction with the final decision resting with the administration.

Table D-1 summarizes College D's responses to the ranking of reasons for doing faculty evaluations at the institution. The two major reasons for evaluations at College D were to provide a basis for general faculty development and to provide each faculty member with diagnostic information concerning instructional behavior and effectiveness. These reasons may well have been influenced by the new student evaluation system, "Idea", which emphasizes feedback to faculty for the purposes of diagnosis of weaknesses and as a basis for improvement of instruction skills. Of least importance for those interviewed at College D was the need to assure equity of employment practices.

Table D-1

Weighted Average	Reasons for Doing Evaluations in Ranked Order at College D	Frequency of Response 1	2	3	4	5	N/A
1.67	1. to provide a basis for general faculty development and improvement.	3	2	1	0	0	0
1.67	2. to provide each faculty member with diagnostic information concerning instructional effectiveness.	4	1	0	1	0	0
2.50	3. to provide information needed in making decisions on salary, promotion and tenure.	0	3	3	0	0	0
3.83	4. to provide data for research on learning and teaching.	0	0	2	3	1	0
4.33	5. to assure equity of employment practices with regard to sex and ethnic differences.	0	1	0	1	4	0

At College D the evaluation process involves the following components and procedures:

1. All faculty are evaluated yearly for the improvement of instruction by student rating scales and by classroom visits.

2. During a pre-visitation conference, the faculty member and division chairperson decide on the visitation schedule - which classes, when, etc.

3. After the visit, the chairperson completes a written summary of comments and discusses same with the faculty member at a post-visitation conference.

4. Faculty member reads written summary and has opportunity for comments and/or rebuttal. Faculty signs the summary to show it's been read.

5. Each semester, in at least two classes, the student rating system known as the "Idea" system will be used for every faculty member in classes "to be determined by the administration." Results of these student evaluations will be returned to faculty within four weeks.

6. Faculty complete a self-evaluation which includes goals and objectives for the year, indicates how successful she/he feels self to be, and discusses results with division chairperson who comments in writing.

7. Summary evaluation is completed by division chairperson with impressions based on other facets of the faculty member's performance and activity. The dean's office adds comments to this summary which then becomes part of the faculty's personnel file.

8. The dean makes final recommendation to the president. For decisions on promotion and retention, additional letters are included, from the division chairperson, dean, regarding years of service, degree held, etc. These letters add support to the faculty member's goals.

9. The president refers the dean's recommendations to the Board. In the past, this recommendation rate has been 80 - 90%; it is hoped that the president can carry 100% of the dean's recommendations to the Board in the future.

The faculty evaluation system at College D is the same for all faculty and involves several mandatory features: classroom visits by administrators including division chairpersons, self-evaluation instruments,

student evaluations ("Idea"), discussions between peer evaluators and the teacher and discussions between administrators and the teacher.

The academic dean is perceived by 83% of those interviewed to be principally responsible for faculty evaluation for decisions on salary increases, promotion and tenure; 17% perceived the president and the Board to be responsible for such decisions. The dean and division chairpersons were jointly perceived by all those interviewed to have the responsibility for evaluation for the purpose of faculty development and improvement.

When asked what the consequences were, both good and bad, of this particular evaluation system, the responses of personnel interviewed revealed the following sentiments. It should be noted again, however, that College D's system is new and hadn't been fully implemented at the time of the visitation. Comments and responses should be viewed with this consideration in mind - one that is not unlike many campuses in the state where new procedures are being developed and introduced. The following represent good consequences of this system:

"1. The dean is perceived as fair. The system has never really been carried out fully nor has it delivered what it promised. The faculty felt student evaluations were misinterpreted. This new system hopes to overcome use of inferences and subjectivity.

" 2. It's provided a stabilized base for comparison; the prior system was too informal. Useful to have a consistent perspective. "

Among those responses listing negative consequences of the same evaluation system are the following:

"1. A history of skepticism on campus regarding faculty evaluations. Faculty felt they were used to deny promotions or tenure or to support the same, rather than to really try to improve instruction.

"2. Inflation of grades.

"3. Some courses have been watered down.

"4. Faculty are uptight about use of faculty evaluations and consider them unfair and a poor method of evaluating instruction. I'd prefer followup studies on graduates or use of statewide, standardized exams to measure outcomes. Accountability is needed.

"5. Faculty felt the "Idea" survey should have been given students earlier in the semester.

"6. Faculty didn't know if "Idea" system was appropriate for College D's students who were less motivated and slower to learn than students upon whom the system was standardized. The question of appropriateness of responses in the survey for community college students.

"7. Frustration. Feeling that it doesn't apply to me or my discipline."

When personnel at College D were asked of the relative strengths of the present faculty evaluation system, their responses were varied and covered a wide area. Following are some of the comments:

"1. Helped faculty see strengths and weaknesses of classroom effectiveness by comparing results with national norms.

"2. Allowed faculty to see selves more objectively than previously and thereby allowed for professional development.

"3. Suggested to faculty whether accomplishing what they set out to and hope and think she/he is accomplishing, by use of the "Idea" system.

"4. Helps faculty to understand in a non-threatening way.

"5. Allows instructor to realize whether or not he's (she's) obtained goals set.

"6. Spells out criteria to be used for promotion."

The same individuals perceived weaknesses in the present system and highlighted a variety of issues that were in need of remedy. Following are some of their comments:

"1. Intimidating.

"2. Not sure it effectively measures good teaching.

"3. Tends to inflate the grading system.

"4. Not personal enough. The "Idea" system does not include open-ended questions as a major part of the system.

"5. "Idea" doesn't bring enough diversity so that a lab course or practical course can be evaluated as well as as a lecture-type course.

"6. Lack of precision, but better than nothing.

"7. Doesn't give a clear answer to questions of promotion, tenure, leave, etc. Too easy to look at results globally. Allows a devious person the chance to set objectives such that they can look good (within the "Idea" system).

"8. Very little to discriminate amongst faculty for merit awards and promotions. Not a comparative element. Good for tenure decisions, but not for promotions because it won't produce a ranking.

"9. Repetitiveness of the same instrument for students weakens the instrument's validity."

As might be expected with a new system in operation for only one semester, most of those interviewed (67%) felt that it was too early to assess the impact on time and workload related to the new system. However, 33% felt that it had changed their ideas of teaching skills and found areas of weakness from feedback of the "Idea" system. It also created more work for those involved in the evaluation process.

Resources at College D were felt to be adequate for travel money and released time. However, most of those interviewed felt there was a lack of follow-through to diagnostic information provided by the system. Not enough follow-up was being done to actually help faculty improve their teaching skills. In general, half of those interviewed felt that resources at College D were adequate for the purpose of faculty growth and development, and half did not.

College D encountered one major problem in the implementation of its evaluation system according to those interviewed: faculty resistance and disinterest. Some noted the lack of administrative time as well, but otherwise, the system encountered no other major problems.

While most of those interviewed agreed that personality issues could become a source of conflict in the evaluation process, most agreed that the present evaluation system did an adequate job of limiting areas of conflict and of diffusing those that arose with objectivity and the involvement of more than one supervisor. Several staff members cited past problems with the previous system that could be characterized as "personality issues", but none had any negative comments about the present system, due in part to its newness as well as to its objectivity of student evaluation instrument. The value of College D's approach, according to one staff member, is that "It's documented, mutually agreed upon by the administration and faculty, upon review by a third party, there's less left to vagueness." The present system has caused some division chairpersons to document the obvious in their goal of case-building. Another felt that the present system lessens bias in the use of student evaluations, self-evaluations and department chairpersons - several sources of evaluation dilute the impact of bias.

Consistent with Colleges A, B and C, was the assessment by College D's personnel that the system allowed for feedback opportunities at every step of the evaluation process. However, unlike the other colleges, College D's system had not provided adequate feedback at the time of this visitation in the form of student evaluation projections or administrative

feedback to faculty. Half of those interviewed cited the lack of administrative time to review in detail each faculty member's evaluation file, as well as the timing of the student evaluations at the end of the spring semester when most faculty had left by the time the feedback data was received. Since the system allows for feedback opportunities in theory, it is hoped that this problem is one of short duration and will be eliminated once the system is fully implemented.

All of those involved in the evaluation process felt that it had been of value to them personally, although as noted previously with other colleges, for different reasons. Some selected comments follow:

"1. "Idea" is a cold way of telling me what I did right or wrong. I would have wanted a more personal way of dealing with my teaching skills.

"2. Makes me more comfortable in knowing I'm being fair to instructors, because I don't know directly what's going on in class and I don't trust my own perception.

"3. It goes a long way toward keeping me in touch with reality and on my toes.

"4. I like to know my weaknesses but not having them rubbed in.

"5. Makes me aware of intricacies, necessities for evaluation, that I need evaluation as well for my own growth and development professionally.

"6. It is an umbilical cord for me, that tells me what's going on out there. I have a love of teaching; it's where the action really is.

"7. For improvement of instruction.

"8. Tells me where faculty are letting down."

Ideal System

A second focus of the interview questionnaire was to ascertain an "ideal" system, one that the respondents would choose if they could, according to their own personal philosophy. Questions about an ideal

system included: if and how evaluation and development issues could and should be kept separate, what wasn't involved in the present system that ought to be, and how they would change the present system if they could. Additionally, what was the relationship between a system's flexibility and the degree of satisfaction with it. The following summaries deal with these "ideal" issues.

Most of those interviewed at College D felt that while it might be nice to separate the issue of evaluation for development from the issue of evaluation for decisions on promotion, salary and tenure, they felt it could not be done. One person suggested separate evaluations for new personnel who would be judged less harshly because of their lack of experience. Most, however, felt that the two issues were inextricably tied together and either shouldn't or couldn't be separated in practice. Some selected comments follow:

"1. Once I have data, I can't divorce myself from them.

"2. Both issues are tangential at certain points. Regarding performance-evaluation by objectives - if someone has not established reasonable objectives and is working toward them, you must ask questions of retention.

"3. Strongly believe they should be, but impossible to do.

"4. Rather than having two separate systems, a basic annual evaluation for improvement and growth with other management issues as outcomes or by-products of an annual evaluation. Decisions thus become easier."

When asked what an ideal system of evaluation should include, the personnel at College D listed the following items as carrying the most weight, as summarized in Table D-2:

Table D-2

Weighted Average	Criteria for Evaluation System Most Heavily Weighted Items	Frequency of Response 5	3	1	0
5.00	Classroom effectiveness, however measured.	6	0	0	0
4.33	Innovation in teaching methods	5	0	1	0
4.33	Attendance and reliability	4	2	0	0
4.00	Ability to work smoothly with peers and supervisors	3	3	0	0

Those items carrying the least weight, and therefore having the least importance in the "ideal" system were the following, as summarized in Table D-3:

Table D-3

Weighted Average	Criteria for Evaluation System Least Weighted Items	Frequency of Response 5	3	1	0
1.67	Accumulation of graduate credits	0	2	4	0
1.67	Personality and self-promotion	0	3	1	2
1.50	Personal life style	1	1	1	3
1.17	Work toward a doctorate	0	1	4	1
0.33	Political activity outside campus	0	0	2	4

The preferred mode of measuring faculty accomplishment at College D was by <u>outcome measures</u> for 67% of the respondents. <u>Performance</u> criteria were preferred by only 33%. Even though outcome measures were preferred, only about half of those listed were acceptable to those interviewed, whereas most of those methods listed for performance measures were

acceptable. Again, the greater acceptance of performance measures may be due in large part to personnel's familiarity with, and experience from, previous systems of evaluation. College D agreed in the same percentage (67%) with College C's personnel in their preference of outcome over performance criteria. College A and B agreed in their preference of performance over outcome measures.

Changes in the timing, use and results of the student evaluation instrument "Idea" were desired by several individuals in response to the question of what needed to be involved in the evaluation system but wasn't at present. Another concern mentioned was the need for continuity at College D: "There has been much change in a short time, but no thoughtful carryover of the sameness of evaluation over these past years." Others suggested that the "Idea" student evaluation forms be given twice a semester and that results be given to instructor and administrator. This would allow a reasonable time for the instructor to evaluator her-/himself as well as for the administration and peers to evaluate the instructor. This would also provide suggestions and opportunities for change in teaching strategies during a semester. Another suggestion was for input from graduates, transfer students as well as those going into the job market. Additional changes suggested by those interviewed included additional diversity in the evaluation system, peer evaluations if done in a proper way, performance evaluation of objectives, and more of a move to outcome measures.

The following changes in the present system were suggested by those interviewed and reflect concerns discussed above:

"1. Go to an outcome measure system more.

"2. Evaluations should be standardized across disciplines.

"3. Followup studies of graduates.

"4. Division exams to keep everyone honest.

"5. Design the system so that labs and lectures could be evaluated in their own personal way, depending on the course or program that's being evaluated. Design questions to relate more closely to issues or content of the course.

"6. Mandate a seminar with administration and faculty to get a joint explanation from technicians regarding the instruments used - "Idea". "

Most of those interviewed agreed theoretically that the more flexibility a campus has the more satisfaction there is with the evaluation process. However, two-thirds of those responding indicated that while College D had flexibility in general on campus, there was not great satisfaction with the evaluation system. Selected comments follow:

"1. We've poured ourselves into a standard form. We're hitting the middle of the road.

"2. An extremely flexible college, but the evaluation system is not - too rigid.

"3. We're flexible here, alot of autonomy as faculty, but there isn't satisfaction with the evaluation process."

Comparison Data: Questionnaire A

This section is based on responses to the questionnaire based in part on the work of Boyd and Schietinger (1976) and the St. Louis Junior College District "Preliminary Report: Faculty Professional Growth Committee" (1974), as well as questions developed by this author for this report. The complete questionnaire may be found in Appendix A.

Table E-1 indicates the ranking of each item of evaluation in an "ideal system" for each college visited. The results for the upper and lower ends of the ranking are consistent with national norms published by the St. Louis Junior College District: classroom effectiveness was ranked first and personal life style was ranked last or near the end.

Table E-2 indicates the ranking of each purpose of evaluation at the local institution for each college visited. This data is summarized in the case study of each college, but is presented here in tabular form for comparison purposes.

Table E-3 compares the responses of each college to the question of preferred ways of measuring faculty accomplishment. Half of this sample (two of four colleges) preferred performance measures and half preferred outcome measures. In the St. Louis study, however, the overwhelming choice of respondents was for performance measures.

The following summaries show the differences and similarities of responses across colleges. Only those questions that were quantified were used for summary purposes in this section.

Table D-1

Question: "Which of the following items do you think should be included in faculty evaluations?" The responses are ranked for each college, with the top five ranks marked with an asterisk (*).

Item of Evaluation	A	B	C	D
1. classroom effectiveness, however measured..	1*	1*	1*	1*
2. availability to students outside required office hours.....	2*	2*	5*	7
3. contributions to department/division.....	3*	10	3*	10
4. development of instructional materials.....	4*	4*	6	6
5. course or curriculum development.....	5*	5*	2*	5*
6. attendance and reliability.....	6	6	4*	3*
7. performing what you're teaching.....	7	8	11	13
8. attendance at in-service, non-credit course work offered by college.....	8	16	17	11
9. innovation in teaching methods.....	9	3*	7	2*
10. unpaid individual or small group tutoring..	10	9	9	21
11. accumulation of graduate credits.....	11	19	16	24
12. willingness to accept advice or help.....	12	17	12	12
13. work on college committees.....	13	15	8	9
14. student counseling and placement.....	14	7	14	17
15. work toward a doctorate.....	15	20	24	27
16. taking enrichment courses outside own field.....	16	18	25	22
17. contributions to local, state or national professional organizations.....	17	13	18	19
18. ability to work smoothly with peers and supervisors.....	18	22	10	4*
19. unpaid consultation in your own field.....	19	12	20	14
20. community service or off-campus courses....	20	14	26	15
21. community service responsibilities.....	21	25	19	18
22. professional publications or exhibits.....	22	11	13	16
23. advising student clubs or activities.....	23	21	15	20
24. student placement in community jobs.....	24	23	22	23
25. responsibility for environmental tasks.....	25	26	21	8
26. personality and self-promotion.....	26	24	23	25
27. political activity outside campus.....	27	28	27	28
28. personal life style.....	28	27	28	26

Table E-2

Question: "Rank the following reasons for faculty evaluation in order of their importance in your program. Use the same number for two or more items considered equally important."

Reasons for Faculty Evaluation	Ranked by College A	B	C	D
To provide information needed in making decisions on salary, promotion, tenure.	1	1	1	2
To provide a basis for general faculty development and improvement.	2	2	2	1
To provide each faculty member with diagnostic information concerning the instructional behavior and effectiveness	2	3	3	1
To provide data for research on teaching and learning.	4	5	5	3
To assure equity of employment practices with regard to sex and ethnic differences	3	4	4	4

Table E-3

Question: "Which way of measuring faculty accomplishment do you prefer?"

Criterion	Colleges (percentages) A	B	C	D
Performance	50%	83%	33%	33%
Outcomes	25	17	67	67
Other	25	0	0	0

Comparison Data: Questionnaire B

This section is based on responses to the questionnaire developed by Miller (1974) which probes staff reactions to their present faculty evalution system. It asks an individual to indicate the level of attention needed at the institution for each factor in the series of questions. The same rating scale is used for each area:

"5 = Does not need attention or not applicable.
4 = Need for attention low.
3 = Need for attention medium.
2 = Need for attention high.
1 = Need for attention is urgent.

The complete questionnaire may be found in Appendix B. In each of the tables following, E-4 through E-11, the responses of staff at each college have been incorporated into a "weighted average" response. Since all staff interviewed did not complete questionnaire B, the weighted averages are based on those who did complete the questionnaire.

The response rate for each campus visited was as follows:

College A = 100% (8 out of 8)
College B = 67% (4 out of 6)
College C = 100% (6 out of 6)
College D = 83% (5 out of 6)

Combined = 89% (23 out of 26)

At one campus, College B, the Acting President had been in office for so short a time that it was deemed advisable not to include those responses to questionnaire B.

Once again, while it is understood that this sample of personnel is limited and certainly non-representative, it is nonetheless of value to look at the responses with the view that they represent the most positive picture of the evaluation systems at each college. The sample

is biased in favor of administrative personnel. These individuals are likely to be less critical than faculty who could be expected to be most critical, and most negative. Therefore, the criticisms and concerns that are represented in the following data summaries reflect a conservative view of the needs in the present evaluation systems. Had the entire faculties of each campus been surveyed, it is likely that the negative responses, and needs for attention would have been more numerous.

Table E-4

The Purposes of Faculty Evaluation

Several common purposes of faculty evaluation are listed below. These uses may or may not be a part of the program at your institution. For each purpose listed below, circle the one number in each horizontal row which best describes your view of that purpose in your institution now.

5 = Does not need attention or not applicable.
4 = Need for attention low.
3 = Need for attention medium.
2 = Need for attention high.
1 = Urgent need for attention

PURPOSES	WEIGHTED AVERAGES A	B	C	D
1. Helping faculty to improve their performance.	3.00	3.00	2.17	2.40
2. Making decisions on retention, tenure, salary, promotion.	4.00	2.75	3.33	2.40
3. Guiding students in their selection of courses and instructors.	3.13	3.25	3.50	3.40
4. Keeping an inventory of personnel resources for reassignment or re-training.	3.63	4.25	3.67	3.20
5. Evaluating curricula, sequences, programs, departments, units.	3.25	3.50	2.00	2.80
6. Informing external audiences on faculty performance.	3.88	4.75	2.17	4.20
7. Conducting research on factors related to faculty performance.	3.63	3.25	2.33	3.00

E-5

Sources and Kinds of Information

Faculty evaluation procedures generate information. Because each source of information (self, students, other faculty, administration, outsiders) has limited insight into any faculty member's performance, the objectivity and completeness of faculty evaluation is enhanced if multisource information is collected from those who are most knowledgeable about particular aspects of faculty performance. Circle the number which best describes your view of the amount or kinds of information collected from those sources in your faculty evaluation program.

SOURCES	WEIGHTED AVERAGES A	B	C	D
1. Students	3.13	2.75	2.33	2.80
2. Peers	3,50	2.50	2.83	3.20
3. Administrators	3.38	2.50	3.00	3.00
4. Self	3.25	2.50	3.00	2.40
5. Weighting	3.13	3.00	3.00	2.40

SCALE

5 = Does not need attention or not applicable.
4 = Need for attention low.
3 = Need for attention medium.
2 = Need for attention high.
1 = Urgent need for attention.

Table E-6

Rating Scales: Students

Methods of faculty evaluation vary from elaborate to simple. Instruments can be derived from research, or derived from practice. Research-based instruments for student evaluation of faculty are abundant, but most forms used for peer, administrator, and self-evaluation are based on practice.. The quality and hence usefulness of information obtained from any instrument-research-based or practice-based - is affected by the several factors shown below. Circle the number which best describes your view of these several qualities of your student rating scales.

FACTORS	WEIGHTED AVERAGES A	B*	C	D
1. Flexibility	3.25	5.00	2.00	2.80
2. Length	3.63	5.00	2.83	3.20
3. Format	3.63	5.00	2.83	3.00
4. Scale Range	4.13	5.00	1.83	3.40
5. Validity	2.50	5.00	1.50	3.60
6. Reliability	2.50	5.00	1.50	3.20
7. Situational Factors	2.38	5.00	2.67	3.20
8. Interaction Factors	2.63	5.00	2.50	3.20
9. Acceptance	2.50	5.00	1.67	3.00
10. Timing and Procedures	2.63	5.00	1.50	2.75

SCALE

5 = Does not need attention or not applicable.
4 = Need for attention low.
3 = Need for attention medium.
2 = Need for attention high.
1 = Urgent need for attention.

*Student scale chosen by College B not in use; therefore not applicable.

Table E-7

Rating Scales: Peer or Other Faculty Member

Circle one number which best describes your view of these several qualities of your peer or other faculty member rating scale.

FACTORS	WEIGHTED AVERAGES A	B	C	D
1. Format	3.25	2.75	2.67	3.00
2. Flexibility	3.75	2.75	2.83	3.50
3. Appropriateness	3.63	2.75	2.50	3.00
4. Acceptance	2.88	2.75	2.17	3.50

Table E-8

Rating Scales: Self

Circle the number which best describes these several qualities of your self-rating scale.

FACTORS	WEIGHTED AVERAGES A	B	C	D
1. Activities	4.25	3.00	2.33	2.80
2. Goals	3.88	3.00	2.17	3.00
3. Purpose	3.88	2.75	2.00	2.60
4. Acceptance	3.38	2.00	2.00	2.80
5. Format	3.88	3.00	1.67	3.40

SCALE

5 = Does not need attention or not applicable.
4 = Need for attention low.
3 = Need for attention medium.
2 = Need for attention high.
1 = Need for attention is urgent.

Table E-9

Feedback: Recipients and Conditions

To a large extent, the purposes of doing faculty evaluation dictate who should receive what information, and in what form. Issues of disclosure, privacy, and confidentiality must be worked out among students, faculty, administrators, and above all, the faculty members evaluated. Factors related to feedback are listed below. For each factor, circle the one number which best describes your view of that factor as it relates to your faculty evaluation program.

RECIPIENTS OF INFORMATION	WEIGHTED AVERAGES A	B	C	D
1. Self	4.13	3.75	3.50	2.80
2. Students	3.25	3.00	2.67	4.00
3. Peers	4.00	4.00	3.67	3.40
4. Administrators	4.13	4.00	3.83	2.40
5. Others	4.00	4.00	2.83	3.50

Table E-10

General Conditions of Feedback

CONDITIONS	WEIGHTED AVERAGES A	B	C	D
1. Disclosure	4.00	3.75	2.83	2.80
2. Timing	4.00	3.75	3.00	3.40
3. Format	3.75	4.50	2.67	2.20

SCALE

5 = Does not need attention, or not applicable.
4 = Need for attention low.
3 = Need for attention medium.
2 = Need for attention high.
1 = Urgent need for attention.

Table E-11

Indicators of Success

The quality of the procedures that characterize a faculty evaluation program are as important - if not more important - than the details of who evaluates what, how, and who gets feedback. The successful faculty evaluation program provides information that contributes to the establishment and continual improvement of quality in faculty performance. The exact measurement of the part faculty evaluation plays in achieving this is end is impossible, given the complex web of other factors involved. However, approximate indicators of a successful faculty evaluation program are identifiable. For each of the approximate indicators of success listed below, circle the number which best describes your view of that indicator as it applies to your faculty evaluation program.

INDICATOR	WEIGHTED AVERAGES A	B	C	D
1. Acceptance	3.63	4.67	3.33	2.60
2. Visibility	3.50	3.33	2.33	2.60
3. Program Administration	4.25	5.00	3.00	3.00
4. Overcoming Resistance	3.50	4.67	2.67	2.80
5. Grievance Procedures and Legal Factors	4.00	3.33	3.67	3.40
6. Affirmative Action	3.75	4.67	3.67	3.40
7. Stages of Development	3.00	5.00	2.17	2.60
8. Maintenance and Renewal	2.88	3.33	2.17	2.60

SCALE

5 = Does not need attention or not applicable.
4 = Need for attention low.
3 = Need for attention medium.
2 = Need for attention high.
1 = Urgent need for attention.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The final goal of this research project was to suggest guidelines for faculty evaluation practices. Such guidelines would be developed out of a comparison of theory with practice in community colleges in New York state. Included in this section will be recommendations for guidelines, suggested and supported by the literature and by applied practices, as well as a summary of both effective and ineffective practices in evaluation programs.

An important part of any recommendation involves an understanding of the author's point of view and those areas of emphasis that reflect personal and professional biases. The guidelines that follow represent this author's point of view as a social scientist trained in the methods and literature of psychology, research and evaluation. Emphasis of certain points regarding human development and social interaction and communication reflects my concern with human developmental issues as well as my concern for faculty investment in the processes by which they will be evaluated. Social psychological literature indicates that people will be most supportive and will invest the most in those practices and procedures in which they've had a major and decisive role in developing. There is evidence in the literature on learning and achievement motivation that the environment or situation in which learning and teaching takes place affects the level of achievement and the degree of satisfaction with the process (Maehr, 1974). Therefore, the situational demands of the institutional

climate, and the quality of the faculty-administration relationship greatly affect everyone's perception of the faculty evaluation system, and consequently, the satisfaction with it. Finally, my personal bias is reflected in my emphasis on the choice of evaluation instruments and procedures, an emphasis which happens to be supported by the literature and theory on evaluation practices. I am also a faculty member of a community college and therefore I reflect that point of view.

With these considerations in mind, the findings and recommendations that follow should be viewed not as a final solution to the complexities and problems of faculty evaluation systems, but as one set of directions that the Faculty Council of Community Colleges in New York state might consider in their search for effective and evolving practices based on theory and subjected to empirical research.

Overview

Several consistent and underlying themes emerge, both from the literature and from a look at applied practices: the best faculty evaluation system is one that is comprehensive in scope and procedures, one that touches base with all segments of the college community, one that is individualized for each faculty member, and one in which the faculty have an investment and therefore the motive to make it succeed. Each component of an evaluation system has the potential for abuse; it can be effective or ineffective. No procedure in and of itself is a fool-proof way of measuring faculty teaching behaviors and their effectiveness in producing student learning.

What is possible, however, is an understanding of the advantages and disadvantages of each component, of the ways in which it can be used effectively and ineffectively. An informed choice, based on research evidence and on experience will be the best insurance that a faculty evaluation system will be based on individual, divisional, and institutional needs.

The two major goals of a faculty evaluation system are (1) for the purposes of institutional personnel management and (2) for the purposes of self-improvement, growth and development. It is clear to faculty that the first goal is universally realized, through administrative and Board actions and behaviors. It is less clear to faculty that the second goal is ever realized, although much lip service is paid to it as a "supposedly" important function of the evaluation process. In practice, there is little evidence that real and meaningful followup attention is paid to faculty who are in need of help for the improvement

of teaching weaknesses or poor teaching skills. Faculty are evaluated and found to be lacking in certain skills or competencies, but often as not they are then left to their own devices to sort out the ways to remedy these deficiencies.

What seems to be of utmost importance to faculty is what happens to their jobs, their livelihoods, their incomes, as a function of the evaluation process. The end results are obvious: salary increases, promotions and tenure or dismissal. The end results of growth and development opportunities are less obvious. One option might be to eliminate from the evaluation system entirely the goal of self-improvement and growth, since as Cohen (1975) has stated, you cannot use the same system to judge and support. One function suffers and one emerges as more significant.

Faculty fear and concern about the evaluation process is based on their perceptions that, in fact, it is used for the purposes of making decisions about tenure, promotion and dismissal. To this extent, their fear is justified. That is exactly how the information compiled is used, on every campus visited. Hopes were expressed that "in the future" more could be done to help individual faculty to grow and to change, etc. Student feedback seemed to help faculty the most in showing faculty how students perceived their classes. Whether this feedback results in any observable changes in teaching behavior has not yet been assessed.

It is not the purpose of this report to advocate any one system of faculty evaluation procedures. Rather, it is the intent here to present

a wide variety of evaluative components with warnings as to their use, potential areas of abuse, ineffective practices and procedures, and possible ways of minimizing or eliminating these. One trend emerges from the literature, over and over again: the evaluation process should be comprehensive and variable in scope in order to allow for the individualization of each faculty member's evaluation program.

As is clear from the individual case studies of colleges visited, no faculty evaluation system is without its detractors and supporters. On each campus visited, personnel responded with concern about those practices and components that were ineffective or lacking. It wasn't so much the component per se that was of concern to personnel, but rather the means of using and administering the component that caused alarm and conflict.

Regardless of what particular component is given heavier consideration on a campus, the following guidelines should be carefully reviewed to prevent and/or minimize the negative consequences frequently found resulting from most faculty evaluation systems.

Guidelines

This section summarizes the guidelines deemed most important and significant for community college faculty evaluation systems. (In the section that follows, each recommendation will be supported by references to the literature and to applied practices reviewed in Appendix C.)

1. FACULTY INVOLVEMENT
   Faculty must be involved in the development of any process that is to affect their professional careers. This involvement needs to be at primary and meaningful level, with all segments of the faculty represented. However the administration seeks to realize this end, through divisional meetings, divisional representatives, faculty association representatives, etc., the crucial issue is that faculty have the major voice in deciding how they will be evaluated.

2. PURPOSES OF EVALUATION
   The purposes of evaluation are directly related to the success of the process. If faculty feel that the evaluation process is truly being done for the purposes of growth, development and the improvement of instruction, they will likely trust the process, the outcomes, the recommendations, the non-punitive atmosphere. However, they are likely to feel mistrustful and wary when the real purpose of evaluation is for issues of personnel management (salaries, promotion, tenure) decisions, but the publicized purpose is for "faculty development". When faculty feel that the data gathered about their teaching skills are going to be used for punitive ends in fact, they are not likely to participate willingly in the process.

3. FLEXIBILITY
   To the degree that the administration is comfortable with variety in the evaluation process, so too will be the degree of flexibility administrations will allow in faculty evaluation methods. This in turn will affect the degree of satisfaction of the faculty with the evaluation process. Where each division decides anew, each year, the methods and persons to be involved in the evaluation process, there seems to be greater satisfaction with the evaluation process, than where flexibility is more limited. That the basis of this process is peer evaluation does not bother the administration at all.

4. COMPREHENSIVE INPUT

All segments of the college community ought to be involved in some way with the evaluation process, but with varying and weighted degrees, depending on the choice of the faculty. Student input may be desirable, but it should be weighted on some basis, along with administrative input, self-evaluation input, peer input, alumni input and followup input. There may be a campus-wide policy on the weightings for each segment of the college community, or each division may decide for itself, depending on administrative comfort and agreement.

5. PEER EVALUATIONS

Where peer evaluations are used, great care should be taken to insure that training procedures and issues in evaluation methods are thoroughly understood. Being a peer does not qualify one for being an evaluator. Personal biases are present and must be understood and not allowed to influence the evaluation of a colleague whose style, philosophy and manner of presentation differs from the evaluators'. This point is well-taken for anyone who does faculty evaluation : deans, division chairpersons, elected division evaluators, peers.

6. PROBLEMS WITH PEER EVALUATORS

When peer evaluators are used, conflict may arise between the parties. Faculty may feel that their colleagues have "stabbed them in the back" if they come out with a negative evaluation. The evaluator may indeed feel "put upon" because she/he tried to be honest and fair and was attacked for having "ulterior motives". As a guideline, it may be appropriate to have mediators, perhaps from the counseling department, present when discussions and/or deliberations are going on. This might prevent or ameliorate the degree of conflict, bad feelings and misunderstandings that may be generated when peers evaluate themselves. This type of situation is less likely to occur when administrators or superiors do the evaluation for it is an assumption that this is part of their job. It is not usually the part of a colleague's job to evaluate another's work.

7. STUDENT EVALUATIONS

Any student evaluation instrument ought to be standardized, either nationally or locally on the population of students served by the institution. This is to ensure reliability of the questions. Several nationally-used student forms are available, for a fee, which have been shown to have high reliability, and which also provide profiles of student responses. It is critical that any student evaluation instrument be responsive to the different disciplines, styles, methods, content, goals of the entire faculty spectrum. Therefore, it is strongly recommended that any student scale in use be one that is able to provide variability, flexibility, and reliability. Additionally, the instruments should be administered several times during a semester to all of the faculty's classes or on a random basis with followup results immediately available to faculty for use within the classroom.

8. SELF-EVALUATION

Self-evaluation instruments should include goals and objectives for each semester or year, as well as the faculty member's assessment about the success of meeting those objectives. The faculty member is in the best position to know if her/his goals have been met and should provide evidence for this assessment. Recognitions, honors, awards, presentations, conferences attended, workshops conducted, etc. should all be included in the self-evaluation instrument as indicators of professional activity and growth. A section on strategies attempted but unsuccessful might be an optional one for faculty to indicate the degree of experimentation and innovation they are willing to allow themselves.

9. EVALUATING THE EVALUATION PROCESS

An ongoing committee on each campus should be charged with monitoring the evaluation process and with updating and evaluating it. However, instead of a campus-wide committee, each division or segment of the college may revise, update or completely change its procedure each year, as one campus does. This will incorporate evaluation into the fabric of the college as an important, necessary and helpful aspect of the services delivered by the college. It will also provide data helpful in giving Boards and legislatures a picture of how the process works and what the tangible outcomes are. It might also legitimize the evaluation process entirely and make it less traumatic. If it is known and expected that the evaluation process is always being improved, it should come as no shock or surprise to faculty when this process in fact occurs - especially if they have been actively and decisively involved in the process.

10. FOLLOWUP AND FEEDBACK

Followup and feedback are two essential ingredients of the evaluation process, especially for growth and development. It is not enough to diagnose a faculty member's areas of weakness in the hope that somehow someway the instructor will find a way out of the dilemma. There ought to be resources and people who will help faculty develop the needed skills and correct ineffective teaching practices. These resources may be on the college campus itself or they may reside in regional centers on university campuses specializing in the improvement of teaching in higher education. Such centers exist in New York state in both public and private sectors. Released time and opportunities for visits to other classes and other campuses are suggestions that with money and released time could be accomplished.

11. INDIVIDUALIZATION

All of the major theorists cited in this report emphasize the need for an individualized approach to faculty evaluation processes. However the program is implemented, the key element must be establishing criteria and choosing measurement techniques that are suited to the faculty member's style, personality, needs and discipline, as well as the strengths and the contributions of the faculty member to the institution. A variable, flexible program that necessitates individualization is essential to a strong evaluation system.

12. CARE IN HIRING PRACTICES

If what community colleges are really interested in is teaching skill and competence, then faculty should be hired for that purpose. Evidence of such competence could be in the form of presentations to classes during the interview process, observations of teaching skills at the present job, video-tapes of past teaching experiences, either as a student or at previous job. If hiring were on the basis of teaching excellence, then evaluation could be used for growth and development purposes in reality, not just in theory. Additionally, dismissal would then be on the basis of program retrenchment, rather than on the basis of lack of teaching competence.

13. PERFORMANCE AND OUTCOME MEASURES

Most faculty evaluation systems measure performance. Research has shown that a positive relationship exists between teacher warmth and concern for students and the achievement of those students. However, most evaluation systems do not measure the outcomes of student achievement in order to assess the effectiveness of faculty performance. This would seem to indicate that only half of the evaluation process is really accomplished. While most people preferred performance measures and were in agreement as to what methods should be used to measure performance, accountability refers to the amount and kind of student learning that takes place. While faculty are not totally responsible for student learning, they do have some input into the process. At this time we are not measuring or developing measures to assess outcomes. We talk about the need for this, but most faculty seem unwilling to take action. It would seem that both kinds of measures need to be included in a comprehensive faculty evaluation system.

14. CLASS VISITATIONS

According to Cohen (1975) classroom visitations have been deemphasized in the last ten years. Other methods of assessing faculty accomplishments have been used to supplement this mode of obtaining data: student input, self-evaluations, peer evaluations, video-tapes. Visitors to a class tend to change the dynamics of that class, affect both the teacher and the students and create an artificial atmosphere that detracts from the purposes of the evaluation system. For these reasons it is suggested that other means be developed and used in place of visitations, at least as much as possible.

15. INSTITUTIONAL CLIMATE

The following factors affect the degree of satisfaction and acceptance of the evaluation process: size of the institution, past history of relations between faculty and administration, amount of stability of administration tenure, opportunities for recourse (grievance, appeal). These factors constitute the institutional climate. If there has been a history of conflict and difficulty at a campus, the odds are high that this climate will be difficult if not impossible to extinguish. Old feelings and attitudes do not die easily, and conflicts over contract negotiations and violations inflame them. All of these factors affect the degree of acceptance and use of the evaluation process.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPLEMENTATION

"Regardless of the local variations, key decisions still have to made in the development of a successful program of faculty evaluation. According to Hildebrand, Wilson and Dienst (1971) the chief sources of disillusionment with programs for teacher evaluation stem from the lack of a sufficently detailed plan which lists the key decisions, anticipates realistic difficulties and possible controversies.

Since their outline is an excellent example of the process to be considered in the development and implementation of any faculty evaluation program, it is reproduced here as a final suggestion for an effective procedure." (pp. 46-48)

"A. Purposes
1. Feedback to instructor for self-improvement
2. Data for making salary, promotion and tenure decisions
3. Information to assist students in choosing courses and instructors
4. Combination of the above

B. Scope
1. Number of Teachers
a. small (all in one department)
b. medium (all eligible for tenure)
c. large (all in the institution)
2. Number of Classes
a. one per instructor per advancement period
b. one per instructor per year
c. each once per advancement year
d. one every other year or every year

3. Number of Students
a. random sample of number of students (large classes only)
b. "X" percent of class (large classes only)
c. all (but with minimum of number of returns to qualify for interpretation)

4. Kinds of Courses
   a. undergraduate credit courses
   b. all except seminar and field research courses

C. Forms
   1. Style
      a. structured check-off items
      b. open-ended essay items
   2. Coverage
      a. teaching only
      b. teaching and course
      c. teaching, course and student data (demographic, objectives, values)
   3. Format
      a. optical scanning sheets
      b. mark-sense sheets
      c. porto-punch cards
      d. duplicated questionnaire with key punch
      e. duplicated questionnaire with hand tally
   4. Length
      a. short (1-25 items)
      b. medium (26-50 items)
      c. long (more than 50 items)
   5. Sources
      a. external (for example, another campus, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, Berkeley)
      b. local committee (faculty, administration, student, etc.)
      c. instructor
      d. combination

D. Administration and Data-Gathering
   1. Time of Distribution
      a. early in course
      b. late in course
      c. with final examination
      d. after course
   2. Method of Distribution
      a. instructor
      b. student representative
      c. administrative representative
      d. with registration packets
      e. by mail
   3. Method of Return
      a. collected by instructor
      b. collected by student representative
      c. collected by administrative representative
      d. mailed to a central office

E. Data Reduction
   1. persons involved
      a. instructor
      b. department
      c. committee (faculty, student, administration, combination)
      d. central office
   2. Method
      a. summarization by computer with norms and variances
      b. hand-tabulation and individual case study
      c. summarization of open-ended data

F. Interpretation of Data
   1. Persons Involved
      a. instructor
      b. department
      c. committee (faculty, student, administration, combination)
      d. central office
   2. Basis
      a. individual Case Study
      b. departmental norms
      c. college norms
      d. campus norms

G. Provisions for Challenge
   1. by instructor
   2. by students or department
   3. procedures
   4. none

H. Dissemination and Reporting
   1. to instructor only
   2. to instructor, department chairperson or committee
   3. to instructor, department chairperson and administration
   4. to college community at a central location
   5. to college community by sale or general distribution "

SUMMARY STATEMENT

Rather than perpetuating the adversary relationship that has existed to date, administrators and faculty need to establish an atmosphere of cooperation to discuss issues of accountability and to jointly decide what evaluative criteria to use and how to assess them. The administration faces outside pressures that faculties need to know and understand. The administration needs to be open with faculty about development goals: if they are not truly a reality, saying they are a goal of the evaluation system will only generate mistrust and skepticism from the faculty. The recommendations made in this section need to be tempered with the quality of the administration/faculty relationship which has been affected by past interactions between them. In part, the kind of evaluation system agreed to, reflects the amount of flexibility in the institution, the administration, and the faculty as well.

Finally, the guidelines suggested in this report represent ideal conditions along with warnings of ineffective practices. They should serve as a standard against which to measure any faculty evaluation system in use, or in development.

REFERENCES

Adams, Henry L. "Favorable Student Evaluations as a Function of Instructor's Age," Improving College and University Teaching, Winter 1973.

Astin, Alexander W. and Calvin B. T. Lee. "Current Practices in the Evaluation and Training of College Teachers," 1966 in Lee, Calvin B. T. (Ed.) Improving College Teaching. American Council on Education, Washington, D. C., 1967.

Batista, Enrique E. "The Place of Colleague Evaluation in the Appraisal of College Teaching: A Review of the Literature," Research in Higher Education, Volume 4: 257-271, 1976.

Bergquist, William H. and Steven R. Phillips. "Designing a Faculty Development Program: Strategies for Faculty Development," Faculty Development and Evaluation in Higher Education, Volume 1, Issue 2, Summer, 1975.

Boyd, James E. and E. F. Schietinger. "Faculty Evaluation Procedures in Southern Colleges and Universities, " Southern Regional Education Board: Atlanta, 1976. ERIC Document No. 121153.

Centra, J. A. "Self-Ratings of College Teachers: A Comparison with Student Ratings," Journal of Educational Measurement, 10: 287-295, 1973.

_____. "Strategies for Improving College Teaching." ERIC Report No. 8, Washington, D. C.: American Association of Higher Education, 1972.

Cohen, Arthur M. and Associates. College Responses to Community Demands. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1975.

_____. "Evaluation of Faculty," Community College Review, Summer 1974, pp. 12-21.

_____. "Work Satisfaction Among Junior College Faculty Members," Paper Presented to Annual Meeting, California Educational Research Association, November 28-29, 1973.

Dressel, Paul L. "Evaluation of the Environment, the Process, and the Results of Higher Education," In A. S. Knowles (Ed.), Handbook of College and University Administration: Academic. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

_____. Handbook of Academic Evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Dwyer, Francis M. "Selected Criteria for Evaluating Teacher Effectiveness," Improving College and University Teaching, Winter, 1973, pp. 51-52.

Faculty Development and Evaluation in Higher Education: A New Quarterly Newspaper. Volume 1, Issue 2, Summer, 1975.

Farmer, Charles H. "Colleague Evaluation: The Silence is Deafening," Liberal Education, October, 1976, p. 432.

Gage, N. L. "The Appraisal of College Teaching," Journal of Higher Education, 1961, Volume 32, pp. 17-22.

Genova, William J., Marjorie K. Madoff, Robert Chin and George B. Thomas. Mutual Benefit Evaluation of Faculty and Administrators in Higher Education. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger Publishing Company, 1976.

Gies, F. J. and B. C. Leonard. "Teacher Evaluation: An Administrative Responsibility," Improving College and University Teaching, Winter, 1973, pp. 53-57.

Gilley, Wade J. "Evaluation and Motivation of Community College Personnel," Center for State and Regional Leadership, Florida: Florida University, Gainesville Institute of Higher Education. May, 1972. ERIC Document No. 060850.

Glasman, Naftaly S. "Evaluation of Instructors in Higher Education," Journal of Higher Education, Volume XLVII, No. 3, May/June, 1976.

Guthrie, E. R. "The Evaluation of Teaching," Air Force Training Analysis and Development Information Bulletin, Volume 4: 199-206, 1953.

Hildebrand, Milton, Robert C. Wilson and Evelyn R. Dienst. Evaluating University Teaching. Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, Berkeley: University of California, 1971.

Hind, Robert R., Sanford M. Dornbusch and W. Richard Scott. "A Theory of Evaluation Applied to a University Faculty," Sociology of Education, Volume 47 (Winter): 114-128, 1974.

Leonard, B. C. and Gies, F. J. "Self-Assessment" Paper presented at the Meeting of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Chicago, March 1973.

Maehr, Martin L. "Culture and Achievement Motivation," American Psychologist, Volume 29, Number 12, December 1974.

Martin, Warren R. "Faculty Development as Human Development," Liberal Education, May 1975, pp. 187-196.

Meeth, L. Richard. "The Stateless Art of Teaching Evaluation," in Change Report on Teaching 2, George W. Bonham (Ed.) New Rochelle, New York: Educational Change, Inc., Summer 1976.

Miller, Richard I. Developing Programs for Faculty Evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

_____. Evaluating Faculty Performance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

Neff, Charles B. "Faculty Development Tug O'War or Up a Tree With a Tuning Fork," Liberal Education, October, 1976, pp. 427-431.

Schulman, Benson R. and James W. Trudell. "California Guidelines for Teacher Evaluation," Community and Junior College Journal, 1972, pp. 32-34.

Seldin, Peter. How Colleges Evaluate Professors. New York: Blythe-Pennington, Ltd., 1975.

_____ and Edward Wakin. "How Deans Evaluate Teachers," Faculty Development and Evaluation in Higher Education, Volume 1, Issue 2, Summer 1975.

Sikkink, Donald E. "Two Proposals for Measuring Effectiveness," Improving College and University Teaching, Winter 1973.

Smith, Albert B. Faculty Development and Evaluation in Higher Education. ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 8, Washington, D.C.: George Washington University, 1976.

St. Louis Junior College District. Preliminary Report: Faculty Professional Growth Committee, November 1974. ERIC Document ED 116738.

Tolle, Donald J. "Evaluation: Who Needs It?" 1970. ERIC Document ED 059716.

Wattenbarger, James L. and Robert S. Carpenter. "Faculty Development: Let Teachers Take the Initiative," Community College Review, June 1975, pp. 25-30.

Webb, W. B. and C. Y. Nolan. "Student, Supervisor and Self-Ratings of Instructional Proficiency," Journal of Educational Psychology, Volume 46, pp. 42-46, 1955.

Wergin, Jon F., Elizabeth J. Mason and Paul J. Munson. "The Practice of Faculty Development; An Experience-derived Model," Journal of Higher Education, Vol. XLVII, No. 3, May/June, 1976.

APPENDIX A

In part based on the work of:

1. James E. Boyd and E. F. Schietinger
   "Faculty Evaluation Procedures in Southern Colleges and Universities," Southern Regional Education Board. Atlanta, 1976. ERIC Document 121153.

2. St. Louis Junior College District
   "Preliminary Report: Faculty Professional Growth Committee" St. Louis, Mo., November 1974. ERIC Document 116738.

3. Sandra F. Mark
   Doctoral Candidate
   Center for Development, Learning and Instruction
   University of Rochester
   Rochester, New York
   July 1977

SURVEY OF FACULTY EVALUATION SYSTEMS

1. Location (College)_____ Enrollment of Institution_____

Department or division_____

Number of years with the College_____Female_____Male_____Full-time_____Part-time_____

Classroom teacher with full load_____ Classroom teacher with released time_____

Department chairperson teaching fewer than 12 hours_____Department chairperson teaching 12 hours, not including overload____ Division chairperson, some teaching_____

Division chairperson, no teaching_____ Other (please specify)_____

2. Listed below are several reasons for faculty evalution. Please rank these reasons ("1" is most important) in the order of their importance in your faculty evaluation program. Use the same number for two or more items considered equally important.

_____to provide information needed in making decisions on salary, promotion and tenure.

_____to provide a basis for general faculty development and improvement.

_____to provide each faculty member with diagnostic information concerning his instructional behavior and effectiveness.

_____to provide data for research on teaching and learning.

_____to assure equity of employment practices with regard to sex and ethnic differences.

_____other (specify)_____

_____

Are these functions realized on your campus? Explain_____

_____

3. In responding to suggested items, please check all those you think should or should not be used, using the following scale:

5 - should be heavily weighted
3 - should be given moderate weight
1 - should be considered but given little weight
0 - should not be considered at all

Which of these items do you think should be included in faculty evaluation? (The committee is not endorsing any item; we have merely compiled a list of things that are sometimes, in some colleges, considered.)

_____advising student clubs or activities

_____innovation in teaching methods

_____course or curriculum development

_____work toward a doctoral degree

_____political activity outside the campus

_____student counseling and placement

_____contributions to department/division

_____development of instructional materials

_____work on college and/or district committees

_____unpaid individual or small group tutoring

_____student placement in community jobs

_____professional publications or exhibits

_____classroom effectiveness, however measured

_____availability to students outside required office hours

_____accumulation of graduate subject matter credits

_____attendance at in-service, non-credit, courses offered by college or district

_____taking enrichment courses outside your own field

_____willingness to accept advice or help

_____development of community service or off-campus courses if not a primary assigned responsibility

_____contributions to local, state, or national professional organizations

_____personal life style

_____community service, as evidenced by voluntary, appointive, or elective responsibilities

_____personality and self-promotion

_____attendance and reliability

_____performing what you're teaching (i.e., art teachers who are working artists, English teachers who produce poetry, science teachers who do research)

_____unpaid consultation in your own field

_____ability to work smoothly with peers and supervisors

_____responsibility for environmental tasks (issuance and monitoring of physical supplies, cleanup in labs, theaters, etc., when student assistance is not available)

_____What else?_____

4. Which way of measuring faculty accomplishment do you prefer? (Please choose only one)

_____PERFORMANCE, as measured by observations, judgment of chairpersons, peers, students, supervisors, etc.

_____OUTCOMES, as measured against specified individualized goals or by student achievement or accomplishment, or both

_____OTHER (be specific)_____

5. In measuring performance, which of these methods should or should not be used?

_____class observation or work observation by supervisors or chairpersons

_____class observation or work observation by peers

_____written student evaluations

_____written peer evaluations

_____written self-evaluations

_____written evaluations by chairpersons or supervisors

_____grievances filed or complaints received from students

_____grievances filed or complaints from peers

_____grievances filed or complaints received from chairpersons or supervisors

_____other (be specific)_____

6. In measuring <u>outcomes</u>, which of these methods should or should not be used?

_____for teachers, an answer to the question, "Did the learner learn what I intended that she/he learn?"

_____summary of passing grades achieved by students

_____quantity of work produced in non-teaching assignments

_____achievement of students as measured by pre- and post-tests

_____summary of students meeting specified behavioral objectives

_____summary of specified behavioral objectives met by non-teaching faculty

_____for teachers, number of student credit hours produced each semester

_____other (be specific)_____

7. Sources of information for faculty evaluation are listed below. Please indicate utilization of each at your institution.

(Check sources utilized)	Complete for sources checked			
		Used for Decisions On		
	Periodically Documented?	Salary Increase	Reappointment Promotion & Tenure	Used for Faculty Improvement
___academic dean or vice president	Yes___ No___	Yes___ No___	Yes___ No___	Yes___ No___
___alumni	Yes___ No___	Yes___ No___	Yes___ No___	Yes___ No___
___colleagues	Yes___ No___	Yes___ No___	Yes___ No___	Yes___ No___
___department chairman	Yes___ No___	Yes___ No___	Yes___ No___	Yes___ No___
___faculty committee	Yes___ No___	Yes___ No___	Yes___ No___	Yes___ No___
___joint student-faculty group	Yes___ No___	Yes___ No___	Yes___ No___	Yes___ No___

(Check sources utilitze	Complete for sources checked			
		Used for Decisions On		
	Periodically Documented?	Salary Increase	Reappointment Promotion & Tenure	Used for Faculty Improvement
___peers in other institutions	Yes___ No___	Yes___No__	Yes___No____	Yes___No___
___president or provost	Yes___ No___	Yes___No__	Yes___No___	Yes___No___
___self (evaluation or report)	Yes___ No___	Yes___No__	Yes___No___	Yes___No___
___students	Yes___ No___	Yes___No__	Yes___No___	Yes___No___
___other (specify)				
_____	Yes___ No___	Yes___No__	Yes___No___	Yes___No___
_____	Yes___ No___	Yes___No__	Yes___No___	Yes___No___

Which of the above is principally responsible for faculty evaluation?

(a) For purpose of salary increase, promotion and tenure_____

(b) For purpose of faculty development and improvement_____

Are the results of evaluation available to the faculty member? Yes ☐ No ☐

8. Listed below are various factors which are considered in faculty evaluation for salary increases, promotion and tenure. Please rank the factors ("1" is most important) that are applicable on your campus. Use the same number for two or more factors considered equally important.

___activity in professional societies.

___administrative management activities, e.g., departmental service, committee work, curriculum development

___civic activities, e.g., participation in conservation efforts, Chamber of Commerce work, etc.

___instructional activity, e.g., classroom teaching, laboratory supervision, ., course preparation

___personal attributes, e.g., cooperation, integrity, loyalty, persistence.

___publications, e.g., books, articles in professional journals.

___public service, e.g., assistance to state government in planning or training.

___research and other scholarly or creative work.

___student advising, e.g., academic counseling

___other (specify)_____

___ _____

9. Please describe briefly your evaluation program_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

10. Experience With Evaluation. If you have been at least a year with the college, what do you think have been the criteria used in evaluating you in the past? Please begin with those you think have been given the most weight and end with those given the least weight.

_____

_____

_____

_____

11. Please describe what you think have been the major (good or bad) consequences of your faculty evaluation program, e.g., changes in faculty morale, in the instructional process, in the quality of teaching.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

12. What impact have you felt personally from the present faculty evaluation system? (more work? more time and energy spent on paperwork and/or visitations, less, no change, etc.).

_____

_____

_____

_____

SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS

13.

Mandatory		Optional	
Development	Promotion	Development	Promotion

1. Classroom visits by administrators.
2. Classroom visits by faculty from some department/division.
3. Classroom visits by faculty from the same department/division and some outside department/division.
4. Classroom visits by faculty from outside the department/division.
5. Self-evaluation.
6. Student evaluation check/lists, forms.
7. Student team visits to classrooms.
8. Discussions between student and teacher.
9. Discussions between peer evaluators and the teacher.
10. Discussions among administrators, peer evaluators, and the teacher.
11. Video-tapes of teaching and replay.
12. Achievement of stated course objectives.
13. Other_____
14. Other_____
15. Other_____

14. How was the present system developed? and by whom?

_____

_____

_____

_____

15. What are its strengths? What does it do best? Why? How?

_____

_____

_____

_____

16. What are its weaknesses? What does it do worst? Why? How?

_____

_____

_____

_____

17. Perceptions of major problems encountered in <u>implementing</u> teaching faculty evaluation programs.

___ 1. Faculty resistance

___ 2. Administrative resistance

___ 3. Low percentage of students returning the evaluation instrument

___ 4. Lack of administrative time

___ 5. Lack of faculty time

___ 6. Lack of money

___ 7. Lack of interest in the program by:

___ a. Faculty

___ b. Students

___ c. Administrators

___ d. Trustees

___ 8. Other_____

18. What isn't involved in the faculty evaluation system that should be? Why? How could it be?

19. If you could change the system in any way, what would you do, how and why?

20. Issues of the separation of evaluation for self-improvement and evaluation for personnel management -- should these two issues be kept separate in practice? If so, how? If not, why?

21. Are "personality" issues of any importance in the faculty evaluation process? Of the evaluator(s)? Of the faculty member? How significant are personality issues, and how does the present system deal with them? Have there been any situations where the system was ineffective? Effective? How so?

22. Of what value to you personally is the present (or any) faculty evaluation system?

_____

_____

_____

_____

23. What opportunity is there for feedback to faculty from the evaluation system?

_____

_____

_____

_____

24. Resources: opportunities for faculty development (may be lacking):

____Travel money

____Time

____Lack of follow-through

____Lack of resources

25. "The more flexibility a campus has, the more satisfaction with the evaluative process" or vice versa. (?)

APPENDIX B

Based on the work of:

Richard I. Miller
Developing Programs for Faculty Evaluation
San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

FACULTY EVALUATION SYSTEMS SURVEY

Name of Institution_____

Enrollment_____

Position_____

Length of Time at Institution_____

Kind of Involvement with Present Evaluation System_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Amount of Involvement_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Teaching Experience_____

_____

_____

_____

The Purposes of Faculty Evaluation

Several common purposes of faculty evaluation information are listed below. These uses may or may not be a part of the program at your institution. For each purpose listed below, circle the *one* number in each horizontal row which best describes your view of that purpose in your institution now.

Purposes	*Does not need attention, or not applicable*	*Need for attention low*	*Need for attention medium*	*Need for attention high*	*Urgent need for attention*
1. Helping faculty to improve their performance	5	4	3	2	1
2. Making decisions on retention, tenure, salary, or promotion	5	4	3	2	1
3. Guiding students in their selection of courses and instructors	5	4	3	2	1
4. Keeping an inventory of personnel resources for reassignment or retraining	5	4	3	2	1
5. Evaluating curricula, sequences, programs, departments, units	5	4	3	2	1
6. Informing external audiences on faculty performance	5	4	3	2	1
7. Conducting research on factors related to faculty performance	5	4	3	2	1

Comments:

Sources and Kinds of Information

Faculty evaluation procedures generate information. Because each source of information (self, students, other faculty, administrators, outsiders) has limited insight into any faculty member's performance, the objectivity and completeness of faculty evaluation in enhanced if multisource information is collected from those who are most knowledgeable about particular aspects of faculty performance. Circle the *one* number in each horizontal row which best describes your view of the amount or kinds of information collected from those sources in your faculty evaluation program.

	Does not need attention, or not applicable	*Need for attention low*	*Need for attention medium*	*Need for attention high*	*Urgent need for attention*
1. *Students:* Teaching skills (pedagogy), course structure (materials, exams, text, readings, papers), work load, level of difficulty, instructor/group interaction, advising and supervision, course interest, the attainment of course and instructional objectives.	5	4	3	2	1
2. *Peers:* Appropriateness of course and instructional objectives, reading lists, texts, exams, sequences, subject matter mastery, service to institution and community, research and scholarly publications, rapport.	5	4	3	2	1
3. *Administrators:* Service to institution and community, course load and other responsibilities, course enrollment factors, long-term evaluation and improvement patterns, market view of course and instructional objectives, inventory of resources.	5	4	3	2	1
4. *Self:* Course and instructional objectives, instructional activities, committee work, service to community, situational factors, use of student instrument to rate self.	5	4	3	2	1
5. *Weighting:* Kinds and sources of information can be weighted, for example, research, service, teaching with percentages of value in total evaluation; or student, peers, etc., with percentage of weight identified.	5	4	3	2	1

Comments:

Rating Scales: Student

Methods of faculty evaluation vary from elaborate to simple. Instruments (rating scales, questionnaires, or forms) can be derived from research, or derived from practice. Research-based instruments for student evaluation of faculty are abundant, but most forms used for peer, administrator, and self-evaluation are based on practice. The quality and hence usefulness of information obtained from any instrument–research-based or practice-based–is affected by the several factors shown below. Circle the *one* number in each horizontal row which best describes your view of these several qualities of your student rating scale.

	Does not need attention, or not applicable	*Need for attention low*	*Need for attention medium*	*Need for attention high*	*Urgent need for attention*
a. *Flexibility:* Allows for diversity in courses and teaching styles, (e.g., by having generally applicable items, a large pool of items to draw from, or alternate forms of the instrument).	5	4	3	2	1
b. *Length:* Not too long; 10–30 items at most; takes 10–20 minutes to complete.	5	4	3	2	1
c. *Format:* No more than two pages; ratings next to each question.	5	4	3	2	1
d. *Scale Range:* Scales with a 1–5 or a 1–7 point range (to yield a wider band of ratings).	5	4	3	2	1
e. *Validity:* It has been demonstrated statistically that the instrument actually measures what it intends to measure, or it has face-validity.	5	4	3	2	1
f. *Reliability:* The instrument has been verified to be reliable over time, e.g., the same or different students will rate a faculty member the same over time (assuming no change in the faculty member's performance).	5	4	3	2	1
g. *Situational Factors:* The instrument includes questions about student characteristics, and teaching conditions which influence evaluators (e.g., class size, major or minor, level, and student's attitude toward instruction and courses generally).	5	4	3	2	1
h. *Interaction Effects:* The fit between student orientation, and class structure and student-teacher interactions which may include "Teaching to the bright students" are variables to be considered.	5	4	3	2	1
i. *Acceptance:* Faculty members and students consider the instrument, and the uses to which the results are put, to be relevant and useful. Both take the process of filling out the instruments, and using results seriously.	5	4	3	2	1
j. *Timing and Procedures:* Students fill out instructor rating scales one or two weeks before classes end–not on the last day or two of classes. These questionnaires are sealed and locked until after final grades are issued, when they are then processed.	5	4	3	2	1
Comments:					

Rating Scales: Peer or Other Faculty Member

Circle *one* number in each horizontal row which best describes your view of these several qualities of your peer or other faculty member rating scale.

	Does not need attention, or not applicable	*Need for attention low*	*Need for attention medium*	*Need for attention high*	*Urgent need for attention*
a. *Format:* Both specific or quantitative and open-ended or qualitative information is requested.	5	4	3	2	1
b. *Flexibility:* Provision is made for including description of unique or special talents or contributions.	5	4	3	2	1
c. *Appropriateness:* Information is requested which evaluator has direct access to (e.g., course materials only if evaluator has reviewed them; classroom teaching only if evaluator has observed it).	5	4	3	2	1
d. *Acceptance:* Faculty members, administrators, and students consider the form and the uses to which the results are put to be relevant and useful. All take the process of filling out the form, and using the results, seriously.	5	4	3	2	1

Comments:

Rating Scales: Self

Circle the *one* number in each horizontal row which best describes your view of these several qualities of your self rating scale.

	Does not need attention, or not applicable	*Need for attention low*	*Need for attention medium*	*Need for attention high*	*Urgent need for attention*
a. *Activities:* Faculty self-evaluation provides opportunity for all activities to be listed in all areas of performance (research, teaching, advising/supervisory and service).	5	4	3	2	1
b. *Goals:* Provision is made for individual's own goals to be identified as to priorities in these areas, or personal values in the institutional context.	5	4	3	2	1
c. *Purpose:* If results are to be used for any purpose *other than* decision about tenure, promotion or salary, etc., the individual's judgment of his own strengths and weaknesses is requested.	5	4	3	2	1
d. *Acceptance:* Faculty member and administrators accept the form and the uses to which the results are to be put, as relevant and useful. They take the process of filling it out and using the results seriously.	5	4	3	2	1
e. *Format:* Form has explicit requests and guidelines, yet allows for additional open-ended comments for unique or special talents, interests or contributions.	5	4	3	2	1

Comments:

Feedback: Recipients and Conditions

To a large extent, the purposes of doing faculty evaluation dictate who should receive what information, and in what form. Issues of disclosure, privacy, and confidentiality must be worked out among students, faculty, administrators, and, above all, the faculty member evaluated. Factors related to feedback are listed below. For each factor, circle the *one* number in each horizontal row which best describes your view of that factor as it relates to your faculty evaluation program.

Recipients of Information	*Does not need attention, or not, applicable*	*Need for attention low*	*Need for attention medium*	*Need for attention high*	*Urgent need for attention*
1. *Self:* The faculty member evaluated receives results from all other persons or groups which evaluate him.	5	4	3	2	1
2. *Students:* Students receive results of their evaluation of faculty.	5	4	3	2	1
3. *Peers:* Other faculty who act as evaluators receive results of this peer evaluation.	5	4	3	2	1
4. *Administrators:* Administrators responsible for making decisions about faculty members (e.g., retention, tenure, salary, promotion, reassignment, retraining) receive results which pertain to the decisions they have to make. This includes the interpretations and recommendations of legitimate review committees.	5	4	3	2	1
5. *Others:* With prior agreement among students, faculty, and administrators, results may be sent to review committees, clinics, or centers for helping faculty to improve, or to prospective employers.	5	4	3	2	1
Comments:					

General Conditions of Feedback

	Does not need attention, or not applicable	*Need for attention low*	*Need for attention medium*	*Need for attention high*	*Urgent need for attention*
1. *Disclosure:* Prior agreements have been formally established among students, faculty, and administrators regarding the acceptable kinds and forms of information to be released to evaluators, evaluatees, and others.	5	4	3	2	1
2. *Timing:* When and in what order feedback is given to all constituents must be established before program begins.	5	4	3	2	1
3. *Format:* All results are in a composite, or interpreted format (to insure anonymity and to present a normative context).	5	4	3	2	1
Comments:					

Indicators of Success

The quality of the procedures that characterize a faculty evaluation program are as important–if not more important–than the details of who evaluates what, how, and who gets feedback. The successful faculty evaluation program provides information that contributes to the establishment and continual improvement of quality in faculty performance. The exact measurement of the part faculty evaluation plays in achieving this end is impossible, given the complex web of other factors involved. However, approximate indicators of a successful faculty evaluation program are identifiable. For each of the approximate indicators of success listed below, circle the *one* number in each horizontal row which best describes your view of that indicator as it applies to your faculty evaluation program.

	Does not need attention, or not applicable	*Need for attention low*	*Need for attention medium*	*Need for attention high*	*Urgent need for attention*
1. *Acceptance:* Students, faculty, and administrators follow procedures and fill out forms completely and on time.	5	4	3	2	1
2. *Visibility:* Students, faculty, and administrators can accurately describe the purposes and procedures of the faculty evaluation program.	5	4	3	2	1
3. *Program Administration:* One person or group assumes responsibility for the uniform, timely and effective collection, processing, and reporting of faculty evaluation results, following established guidelines.	5	4	3	2	1
4. *Overcoming Resistance:* Those responsible for administering the program are successful in finding ways of resolving or diffusing the complaints or passive resistance of students, faculty, or administrators.	5	4	3	2	1
5. *Grievance Procedures and Legal Factors:* Specific mechanisms exist for the resolution or grievances.	5	4	3	2	1
6. *Affirmative Action:* The evaluation procedures are considered fair and objective, but allow for affirmative action concerns.	5	4	3	2	1
7. *Stages of Development:* The faculty evaluation programs have been established and improved through planning, pilot testing, gaining acceptability, wide-spread adoption, and review and replanning.	5	4	3	2	1
8. *Maintenance and Renewal:* Strong sponsorship exists from top administrators who provide adequate financial support and advocacy for the long-term maintenance and renewal of the faculty evaluation program.	5	4	3	2	1

Comments:

APPENDIX C

Supporting Statements

Supporting Statements

Each of the guidelines recommended in the previous section are supported by reference to the literature and/or to applied practices. In this section, each recommendation will be cited again, with quotes and reference to supporting documentation.

1. FACULTY INVOLVEMENT

A. "Words don't mean...people mean. In every organization there are at least two systems: the formal and the informal.... A view of the accepted evaluation guidelines tells us what the formal system is but the informal procedures remain paramount. Whether the new faculty evaluation plans will live or die, will enhance, detract from, or have no effect on the work of the individual instructor depends solely on the way they are implemented."

(Cohen, 1974, p. 15)

B. "Counting the hours instructors spend on the job or 'evaluating them' by observing them in the classroom may satisfy the external auditors, but it does not directly affect instructor motivation. It is more important to understand what faculty themselves feel they are producing. Only this factor can be related appropriately to the instructor's satisfaction with the work - or with the pattern of work itself - because it is the only one they truly consider." (Cohen, 1973, p. 6)

C. "... work toward the general involvement of faculty and administration in the planning... Don't force a system of evaluation on the faculty, but seek prior general acceptance. Nothing has less meaning or does more harm than appraisal practices which are distrusted by those being appraised."

(Tolle, 1970, p. 14)

D. "... Self-interest recognizes the primacy of self in decisions, and it includes also self-satisfactions gained by those who develop, install, and operate a system of evaluation. They come to have a vested interest in seeing the system work and therefore they work hard for its success."

(Miller, 1974, p. 12)

2. PURPOSES OF EVALUATION

A. "... the acceptance or rejection of the methods of evaluation often relates to the degree of acceptance or rejection of the purposes of evaluation." ... But it is generally at the point that evaluation is used for purposes other than improvement of instruction that the main problems arise."

(Tolle, 1970, pp.3-4)

B. "Improvement of instruction was generally conceded to be the most valid purpose of evaluation (on the research pursuant to California's new law). ... Respondents (from a survey of the Los Angeles Community College District) showed mistrust of the purposes of evaluation for tenured instructors, fearing that it might interfere with academic freedom and could stifle creativity and innovation."

(Schulman and Trudell, 1972, pp. 32-33)

C. "One faculty evaluation scheme cannot both judge and assist."

(Cohen, 1975, p.152)

3. FLEXIBILITY

A. "Little is to be learned by reviewing the many plans that were produced in response to the (California, 1971) legislation. Suffice to say that they differ from the procedures in operation a year earlier primarily in that they state specific guidelines for the involvement of the various groups on campus. Indeed this "must" was written into the legislation - students, faculty members, administrators and the instructor (her/himself) should all have a say in each faculty member's evaluation. Other than that difference - which took evaluation out of the sole hands of the administration - little has been added that is new except for extensive committee review and checkback procedures."

(Cohen, 1975, pp. 147-148)

B. "The search for an objective measuring device in such a subjective area is doubly difficult when the groups involved (faculty, chairpersons, deans, students) look at the question of (teaching) effectiveness from different frames of reference."

(Sikkink, 1973, p. 60)

C. Applied practices at College C are an example of great flexibility in choice of sources of input and of measurement methods all of which are determined anew each year by the individual departments, with the agreement of the administration. Faculty acceptance of this process seemed high, and support was strong. It seemed to work in practice, though not without problems.

(See Case Study of College C)

4. COMPREHENSIVE INPUT

A. "The literature also revealed that an eclectic approach to evaluation was most fair and that teachers, administrators and students should be involved in the process; but there was disagreement as to the role each should play."
(Schulman and Trudell, 1972, p. 33)

B. "It has been found that participation on the part of all individuals in the development of organizational objectives is conducive to commitment to those objectives."
(Gilley, 1972, p. 17)

C. Applied practices at all colleges indicated a need for more involvement of all segments of the college community, especially in response to Questionnaire B. Refer to "Comparison Data: Questionnaire B" section of this report, p. 88.
(Comparison Data, p.88)

5. PEER EVALUATIONS and 6. PROBLEMS WITH PEER EVALUATIONS

A. "Professionals are oriented toward control by standards shared by members of their own occupational group. They attach greater importance to evaluation by their professional colleagues than to evaluations by non-professionals. ...We hypothesized that the most influential evaluators would be professional colleagues, more influential than superiors in the administrative hierarchy. Findings supported this hypothesis."

(Hind, Dornbusch and Scott, 1974, p. 118)

B. "... the diversity of people in different disciplines can best be encouraged and evaluated at the level where they are most intimately known by their peers."

(Farmer, 1976, pp. 432-433)

C. "There are activities and faculty behaviors that can be evaluated more validly and reliably by fellow colleagues than by anyone else."

"Colleagues seldom see each other in the action of teaching, so the information about the quality of teaching, services, and research often comes from overheard remarks and comments from sources with no authority to make sound evaluations of faculty. Evaluations by colleagues may also be frequently based on outdated or very imprecise information and affected by departmental jealousies and rivalries. At the same time, we must note that in some cases outstanding teaching generates in some faculty members negative feelings."

"Colleague evaluation should be based on a clear conception of what 'good teaching' is. By this I mean two things: arriving at a consensus defining what is to be evaluated, and a specification of what the typical faculty member is accountable for. ...In addition, colleague evalution must occur only on those aspects of faculty behavior in which peers are in a clear and better position to evaluate faculty members."

(Batista, 1976, pp. 257-271)

7. STUDENT EVALUATIONS

A. "... it is widely agreed that student ratings are among the best criteria of instructor effectiveness. ... While the differences are small, there is a consistent decrease with each decade (of an instructor's age). The younger the instructor the higher the rating."

(Adams, 1973, p. 72)

B. "What is lacking is evidence that the qualities of instructors listed on any particular scale make any real difference in the achievement of predetermined educational objectives by students. Ratings can boast considerably more reliability than validity. Research indicates that the concept of teaching effectiveness is a complex human phenomenon to study or evaluate."

"Opposition to the use of student rating scales increases when the results are used to compare one teacher with another. This opposition may be justifiable in that teacher effectiveness may vary with different types of students, objectives to be achieved, and methods and techniques of instruction used in the presentation. Often it is not readily apparent to those being rated just what is being measured."

(Dwyer, 1973, pp. 51)

C. "It is unlikely that an instructor could use the findings of this study to elicit higher student ratings than (she/he) deserves; scholarship, rapport and enthusiasm are difficult to simulate and students are not easily deceived. There are circumstances, however, which can adversely affect a good teacher's performance. (Her/His) workload may be too heavy, classes may be too large, may have been assigned to teach outside the area of greatest competence, course may be new and untried, or may be experimenting with innovations. And although the student properly rates the teacher on how good student perceives the instruction to be, not on how good it could have been or will become, it would be unfortunate if rating procedures either penalized teachers for factors beyond their control or encouraged them to offer only 'safe' familiar instruction. This danger can be minimized if it is recognized and appropriate steps taken to bring any such special circumstances to the attention of the administration.

"The instructor might be granted the option of retaining ratings for exclusive use the first time that instructor teaches any one course. Thereafter all returns should be transmitted at least to the department, but we suggest that provisions be made so that the instructor can challenge individual returns that seem malicious or invalid and file a comment on the ratings."

144

(Hildebrand, Wilson and Dienst, 1971, p. 39)

8. SELF-EVALUATION

A. "Greater emphasis should be placed on self-evaluation as a major source of information to be used in appraising teaching performance. Because few faculty members are trained in objective self-evaluation techniques, it is most important that they be offered specific techniques in training on college campuses as well as in regional seminars and meetings. Faculty members can gain needed self-evaluation skills as well as a stronger appreciation for self-evaluation as a valuable appraisal technique."
(Seldin, 1975, pp. 79-81)

9. EVALUATING THE EVALUATION PROCESS

A. "A permanent committee on faculty evaluation should be appointed at every (college). It should have as participants academic administrators, faculty, and students. The major function of this group should be the continual review of current evaluation policies and practices. In addition, the committee should be responsible for the adaptation to local conditions at their institution of the (national) master plan which should be developed as outlined on a national level."

(Seldin, 1975, pp. 79-81)
(Seldin and Wakin, 1975, p. 8)

10. FOLLOWUP AND FEEDBACK

A. "... the survey proved that teachers are eager to avail themselves of relevant, updated techniques that they can readily incorporate into their teaching. ...Promoting faculty development on the basis of faculty-assessed needs is paramount."

(Wattenbarger and Carpenter, 1975, p. 30)

B. "Both (faculty development and faculty evaluation programs) believe that the contracting approach is one of the best procedures for achieving a qualitative change in a faculty member's performance. Note that it is usually the department chairperson with whom the faculty member contracts. ... They both share the common weakness of having ineffective evaluation systems."

(Smith, 1976, pp. 14-15)

C. " ... institutions have moved toward 'growth contracts' whereby a faculty member and (her/his) academic supervisor establish explicit criteria for assessing and rewarding not only performance but also improvement."

(Bergquist and Phillips, 1975, p. 5)

11. INDIVIDUALIZATION

A. "... One way is to formalize individualized development plans, wherein the individual and the institution agree on mutual expectations. Another is to engage the faculty in major resource allocation decisions. Whatever form we choose, the important thing is to create an atmosphere of explicitness about the intentions on all sides."

(Neff, 1976, p. 430)

B. "Most of the ideas being discussed in connection with faculty development programs are of greater importance to the institution than to the individual, to the administration than to the faculty. Also, they have more to do with procedure than with substance. They have less to do with learning and the learner than they do with quantifying and categorizing the relationship between teachers and students. There is an understandable hesitation on the part of faculty to collaborate in this kind of development."

(Martin, 1975, pp. 187-196)

12. CARE IN HIRING PRACTICES

A. Applied practices indicated that most administrators feel that enough attention is not being paid to the most important element of the evaluation process - the hiring stage. Administrators at College A in particular felt strongly that if the hiring process was a strong one, the evaluation program became easier and less conflicted.

(See Case Study of College A)

13. PERFORMANCE AND OUTCOME MEASURES

A. "When an instructor has been rated as possessing a number of characteristics on a scale there is no reliable evidence that those characteristics are the ones that will facilitate or hinder student achievement of specific educational objectives, and ultimately this is the area in which the results should be evident."

(Dwyer, 1973, p. 51)

B. "Many consider effective teaching to be of excellent quality if it is in proportion to progress made by learners toward stated educational objectives. However, while this concept is generally sound, it is difficult to apply to the characterization or evaluation of (college) teaching because there is now insufficient agreement either on objectives or on who should determine them. And even if there were widely accepted specific objectives, it is unlikely that there could now be agreement on how to test progress toward the attainment of many of them. Facts learned from the teacher can be tested, but their value cannot; the contribution a teacher makes to spiritual or emotional maturation cannot easily be assessed."

(Hildebrand, Wilson and Dienst, 1971, pp. 34-35)

14. CLASS VISITATIONS

A. "... one element has been notably de-emphasized - the classroom visitation by the division chairman or dean, which was formerly the primary source ofevaluation. This has taken its place as only one of many elements of a thorough evaluation, including, for example, examination of the instructor's course objectives, perusal of student rating forms, and self-evaluations submitted by the instructor."

(Cohen, 1975, pp. 147-148)

15. INSTITUTIONAL CLIMATE

A. Maehr hypothesized that achievement motivation was affected by the individual's culture which affected personality development directly, as well as by the personality of the individual which both affected and is affected by the specific situation. The formulation is as follows:

C--------→ P ←------→ S = M

This can be generalized to the institutional climate, if one substitutes institutional climate for culture, the individual teacher's performance for personality and the teaching situation for S. M could still stand for motivation, or it could also stand for satisfaction with the evaluation process.

(Maehr, 1974, p.892)

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

OCT 2 0 1978

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES